

The University of Chicago

PANHELLENISM IN GREEK TRAGEDY

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY
OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES IN
CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF
PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF GREEK LANGUAGE
AND LITERATURE

1937

By
HAROLD BAKER DUNKEL

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1937

The University of Chicago

PANHELLENISM IN GREEK TRAGEDY

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY
OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES IN
CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF
PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF GREEK LANGUAGE
AND LITERATURE

1937

By
HAROLD BAKER DUNKEL

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1937



PREFACE

Although the ancient Greek peoples were always unable to unite in the formation of an independent nation, nevertheless, desire for unification did exist. The present study collects and examines this Panhellenic sentiment as it appears in extant Greek tragedy, both in the text of the plays and in their general tone and emphasis as well.

The references for the complete plays of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides are to the lineations of the editions in Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis; for typographical reasons, however, the citations are quoted from the translations of the Loeb Classical Library by H. W. Smith, F. Storr, and A. S. Way, respectively. Any difference in the textual readings does not affect the interpretation of the passages as expressions of Panhellenic sentiment. Whenever the English translation seemed to obscure the point, the Greek text has been added. Aristophanes has been quoted in the translation of Rogers.

For the fragments, the works of A. Nauck, Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta², of A. S. Hunt, Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta Papyracea, of E. Diehl, Supplementum Sophocleum, and of H. von Arnim, Supplementum Euripideum, have been consulted. Since the pertinent fragments, however, all appear in Nauck's collection, references are to that work and the quotations are my own rather literal prose-translations.

Unless the contrary is specified in particular cases throughout the following pages, "Hellas" and "Hellene" are synonymous with our modern usage of "Greece" and "Greek."

My sincere thanks are due to Professor Gertrude Smith and to Professor Robert J. Bonner, not only for the suggestion of the subject, but also for their encouragement and criticism.

I should be ungrateful were I not to mention also Ernest L. Hettich, whose A Study in Ancient Nationalism; the Testimony of Euripides has received my close attention. Since his interpretation of "nationalism" included "city-statism" and "imperialism," and since his study emphasized these phases of "nationalism" more than "Panhellenism," the point of view of the

present study is quite different. However, although Hettich has treated the material of only one tragedian and that from a different standpoint, I have found his work helpful for comparison and for suggestion.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE BACKGROUND OF PANHELLENISM	1
II. PANHELLENIC STATEMENTS IN THE PLAYS.	12
III. THE PANHELLENIC TONE OF THE PLAYS.	36
IV. THE ATHENIAN EMPIRE AND PANHELLENISM	54



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/IA41548410_0045

CHAPTER I
THE BACKGROUND OF PANHELLENISM

A paradoxical comment on the history of the Greek people might consist of the statement: the Greeks, because of their intense love of liberty, lost their liberty. Or rather, the Greeks, by their excessive patriotism, made a nation of Greeks impossible. That these two statements contain more literal truth than many paradoxes is obvious to the most casual student of Greek history.

The ancient Greek was famous for his love of patris. The poets sang of it in their most touching odes; the orators proclaimed it in their most exalted periods.¹ Even if we discount this evidence as literary convention and rhetorical bombast, we can scarcely doubt that a people which regarded banishment from one's patris as a punishment comparable with death must have held that patris in high esteem. If we undertake, however, to translate patris, we find the key which unlocks the preceding paradoxes. We can not render the term by "native land" if by that expression we imply "Greece." Nor can we use "land," even if we limit its meaning to such a district as Boeotia or Argolis. A citizen banished from Thebes did not need to leave Greece; he did not need to leave even Boeotia. A few miles away in Orchomenos he was in exile. Consequently, our nearest approximation to patris is "native city." Hence the Greeks could never unite; they were loyal to a city, not to a nation.

All the political functions of the Greeks centered in their city. In that city's physical grandeur and in its reputation they took personal pride. In the government of that city they desired full political rights and control. But their patriotism did not stop there. They wished the city to have complete freedom of action in its local sphere of influence. For a city to join a league and, as a result, to be forced to limit its individual decisions and actions by a consideration of the good of the whole

¹Iliad xii. 243 is an early example.

federation and to furnish economic and military support in crises not directly affecting that city, seemed to the Greek citizen an unthinkable diminution of his city's freedom and his own as well. In terms of the history of the United States, the conflict was one of "the rights of the sovereign states" as opposed to the supremacy of the federal union. In Greek history, "states' rights" were always supreme.

Some apparent exceptions to this rule did exist. The Greeks formed alliances. In the presence of a powerful enemy they would ask for aid from their neighbors. These neighbors, either because their safety too was at stake or in return for certain concessions to their own interests, would furnish support. But these alliances were temporary; they were prompted by self-interest, not by any sense of duty or by desire for cooperation. As soon as such a league became unprofitable for one of the parties, that state felt at liberty to fail to renew the treaty or even to break it and to enter a combination hostile to its former ally.¹

At an early date Attica was unified under a single government; but this synoecism did not result in a federal government but merely in a spatial extension of the city-state. Eleusis was not a sister city of Athens politically but rather a suburb. An inhabitant of Eleusis was not strictly a citizen of Attica but of Athens where he exercised his political rights.²

Laconia too formed a unit, but that district, along with Messenia, formed a Spartan empire whose cohesion was secured only by force. Citizenship was vested in the Spartans alone while the other inhabitants, reduced to the condition of helots, were always ready to revolt.³ Boeotia was another example of unwilling union to which not only some of the subject cities such as Platea objected, but even the other Greek states as well.⁴

¹Cf. the vacillation of Megara in the middle of the fifth century B. C. Thucydides i. 103. 4; 114. 1.

²Cambridge Ancient History (hereafter cited as CAH), III, 578-80. R. Bonner and G. Smith, The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle (University of Chicago Press, 1930), pp. 57-59.

³Thuc. i. 101-102.

⁴Cf. the controversy in 387 B.C. at the time of the King's Peace. Xenophon Hell. v. 1. 32.

Another type of union was that known as *συμπολιτεία*¹ of which one of the early examples was the Chalcidian Confederacy which began as a synoecism in Olynthus in 432 B.C.² Although this confederation sought to preserve independence in the local governments and to assign to the federal power only those functions which were clearly its own,³ the league seemed to many cities to be a threat to their freedom.⁴

Thus, through these various organizations, the Greeks sought to unite. The methods all had limitations: they were local in character and many of them were temporary. Nearly all of them were under the domination of one particular state. In some instances, this rule was maintained by a minimum of force, but sooner or later, nearly all the federations had unwilling members. These facts varied in the different cases. Yet one and all the leagues were wrecked on the rock of city-statism. So long as city could not and would not unite with city to form a true nation and hence give a larger outlet for her citizens' patriotism, this intensely localized allegiance was the greatest bar to national unity.

The political history of Greece is marked by intense particularism, the defect accompanying that ideal of freedom in a free community which was built up by the city-states. On the other hand, the greater part of Greek history is a chronicle of the unsuccessful attempts to create a larger political unit than the city state, the impulse to which was in part imposed by political necessity, but in part arose from a common

¹Cf. Schwahn in Pauly-Wissowa *s.v.* *συμπολιτεία* and G. Fourères in Daremberg-Saglio *s.v.* *κοινόν*.

²Thuc. 1. 58. 2. Xen. *Hell.* v. 2. 12 ff.

³Schwahn, *op. cit.*, p. 1193: "Zur Zuständigkeit des Bundes gehörten die auswärtigen Angelegenheiten, die Bundesgesetzgebung, das Zollwesen, das Kriegswesen, das Münzwesen."

⁴Bury has aptly stated the difficulties met by this confederacy: "All the cities had common laws, common rights of citizenship, intermarriage and commerce; Olynthus did not assume a privileged position for herself. The neighboring Greek cities were also asked to join, and some of them, Potidaea for instance, accepted the offer. But it was always a sacrifice for a Greek city to give up its hereditary laws and surrender any part of its sovereignty, whatever compensating advantages might be purchased. . . . The Olynthians, as their work grew, conceived the idea of a confederate power which should embrace the whole Chalcidic peninsula and its neighborhood. Once this ambition took form, it became necessary to impose by force their proposition upon those who declined to accept it freely" (*A History of Greece* [London, 1931], p. 558).

consciousness of race. In Greek religion, intensely political in character, these two tendencies are also in evidence, the one working towards particularism, the other towards a wider Panhellenic unity, and in religion as in politics the Greek--like other ancient peoples--failed to solve the antimony.¹

This inability of the Greeks to unite politically, in spite of their common racial and cultural background and of the mutual advantages such a union would have given, is one of the truisms of ancient history. Its pages are full of the common distrust, bickering, treachery, and even open war among the various city-states. If as Thucydides says² the Trojan War constituted the first great united effort of all the Hellenes, it was also the last. Even the glorious epoch of Marathon and Salamis shows little real Hellenic unity. In fact, examination of the account of Herodotus leaves one with the impression that Greece escaped Persian domination more through good luck than good management. At least, individual skill and courage rather than harmony of the Greek cities made resistance effective. In Thucydides' account of the following years, the record is all one of the strife of Greek with Greek. And, as we draw near the end of the classical period, the speeches of Demosthenes and his contemporaries show how the enemy's technique of "divide and conquer" worked almost without resistance until Greece came under the sway of Philip and Alexander.

On the other hand, in spite of the failure of the Greeks to form a united people politically and of their willingness to carry on deadly commercial and martial warfare against each other, they were not without a sort of national consciousness. They recognized their position as members of a group to which they gave the name, Hellenes.³ Those outside this group were "barbarians." Of this national consciousness the earliest trace is the appearance in Homer of the word Πανελλήνους.⁴ Aside from this suspected passage, in Homer the term, Hellenes, has only a local significance;

¹CAH, II, 539.

²1. 3.

³Bury, JHS, XV (1895), 217 ff.; K. J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte* (2d ed.; Strassburg, 1912), I, 272; G. Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte* (2d ed.; Gotha, 1893), I, 196 ff.

⁴*Iliad* II. 530. Critics as early as Aristarchus of Samothrace questioned this line.

but thereafter, beginning with Archilochus¹ about the middle of the seventh century, the meaning of the term spread from this local designation until it came to denote all those whom we call Greeks.

The criteria for determining who was to be included in this classification were broad but rather definite. Herodotus² mentions common blood, common language, common sanctuaries and festivals of the gods, and common manners. Throughout the period of Greek history under discussion, by these means the distinction between Greek and barbarian was drawn. Modern scholars too have been faced with the problem, in attempting to discuss the Greek people, of defining what made the Greeks Greek and of discovering what forces promoted such unity as the Greeks did achieve. For the most part they³ have added little to the dictum of Herodotus. The main springs of Hellenic unity were common race, common language, the tradition of united participation in the Trojan War, the position of the Homeric poems as a national epic, and common religious shrines, ceremonies and customs.

These points were the distinguishing mark of the Greek. They were not simply facts of historical and religious belief; as we shall see later when each of these subjects is taken up in more detail and applied to the problem under discussion in this study, these bonds of unity were very close to the daily life of each citizen. If these tendencies towards union did not produce national organization, at least they fostered a national feeling of unity. Local pride and love of independence were always too strong for the feeling of unity to become a fact; but the feeling of kinship was there.

Although the Greeks never did achieve true unity, the realization of the advantages which a union of Greece would have brought and of the potentialities latent in such a combination is not a modern discovery, as several of the men of the period expressed their hope for such a union as this and strove for the

¹Quoted, Strabo viii. 6. 6. Another passage is Hesiod's Works and Days 528 which Paley considers as belonging to a late stratum of the poem (Hesiod [2d ed.; London, 1883], p. 75).

²viii. 144.

³G. Grote, History of Greece (12 vol. ed.; London, 1869), II, 238 ff.; Beloch, op. cit., I, 270 ff.; Bury, History of Greece, pp. 160-61.

materialization of that hope. Aristophanes, Isocrates, and Demosthenes are names which immediately come to mind. Each of these men was an active advocate of Panhellenism as a cure for the evils of Greece; but each had a different method according to the political situation at his time.

Aristophanes¹ lived and wrote during the sad years of the Peloponnesian War, which he saw bringing death and ruin to all Greece. What marked him off from his fellows was that he was not so blinded by Athenian patriotism that he failed to see that the fault was shared by all the Greek cities alike, and dared to make his opinion public.² Although he did not recommend any definite organization, he made it plain that the Athenian allies should, even at the sacrifice of local pride and tradition, unite, presumably in a federal league.³ In short, during the period in which this present study is most interested we know of one dramatic poet who openly espoused the cause of Panhellenism.⁴

¹The collection of the Panhellenic material in Aristophanes has been made by W. M. Huggill. The published portion of his work, Panhellenism in Aristophanes (University of Chicago Press, 1936), treats directly, however, only the Lysistrata. Gilbert Murray, Aristophanes, a Study (Oxford, 1933), gives a general discussion of Aristophanes' Panhellenism. The various standard editions of the poet treat the question, particularly in the introductions to the Acharnians, the Peace, and the Lysistrata.

²Cf. Murray, op. cit., p. 59.

³Huggill, op. cit., pp. 67-102, particularly pp. 91-94.

⁴Since this discussion will deal with the tragedy of the fifth century, perhaps a brief example of the type of material offered by comedy in this same period may not be amiss, not only for introduction, but also for supplement and contrast. For this purpose the Peace, one of Aristophanes' most Panhellenic plays and a work produced about the same period as some of the tragedies which will concern us most, may well serve. This comedy, produced in 421 B.C., the year of the Peace of Nicias (Thuc. v. 20), gives not only the poet's personal Panhellenic views but shows the usual love of "city-statism."

About ten years of the Peloponnesian War have passed. Now the sentiment for cessation of hostilities has set in and will soon be followed by the formal peace. Trygaeus, the hero, in his flight to Heaven for Peace is simply the dramatic embodiment of Aristophanes' idea that the Greeks should cooperate to prevent the recurrence of inter-Hellenic strife. The hero is not opposed to war because it will hurt Athens. Her sufferings alone do not impress him. His point of view is broader: war hurts all Greece. Consequently, his daring flight is on behalf of all the Greeks, not his fellow-citizens alone.

My flight for the sake of all Hellas I take,

The position of Isocrates¹ is well stated by Jebb:

The fourth century B.C. is filled with the feverish struggle of the Greek states for two objects, one of which was no sooner partly gained than it seemed to conflict with the other;--the unity of Greece, and the freedom of the individual Greek state. Athens is the center of this struggle. The sentiment of Greek unity created by the Persian Wars revived after the exhausting struggle of the Peloponnesian War.²

In this period Isocrates lived. Like Aristophanes he desired Greek unity; but, unlike the comic poet, he had a plan: "By

A novel and daring adventure preparing. (93-94)

I'm going to ask him what he is going to do
About the Hellenic peoples one and all. (105-106)

Once the actual task of pulling out Peace begins, we clearly see that the work is Panhellenic. Here (292) one of the few times in Greek "history" the leader could exhort his men as ἄνδρες Ἕλληνες. The group is not drawn up against other Greeks, but for all Greeks. This sentiment is reinforced in line 302 where the all-inclusive--and consequently, rare--term Πανέλληνες is used.

Then follows the famous scene in which the men of the Greek cities actually all pull together for Peace. Along with the wool-spinning scene of the *Lysistrata* this passage is the *locus classicus* for fifth century Panhellenism. As I have said, the poet advocates no specific system. He simply shows the joys as well as the necessity of concerted action for peace. And this he does in a figure so simple that every spectator must have understood it. Finally, the prayer which the poet has his hero make is certainly his hope for Greece:

And O put an end to the whispers of doubt
These wonderful clever
Ingenious suspicions we bandy about,
And solder and glue the Hellenes anew
With the old-fashioned true
Elixir of love and attemper our mind
With thoughts of each other more genial and kind. (993-7)
Tribeless, lawless, and hearthless is he that
delighteth in bloodshed.
Bloodshed of kith and kin (ἐπιδημίου) heart-
sickenning, horrible, hateful. (1097-8)

The preceding citations give only the most important Panhellenic touches. But far more than these direct references, the entire plot of the play is Panhellenic. The great idea of Trygaeus is, in fact, nothing else than that the Greeks should all work together for peace. From that peace will come all manner of fruit for the Greeks--shown dramatically by the joys of Trygaeus in the final scenes.

¹For Isocrates' Panhellenism, cf. J. Kessler, *Isocrates und die panhellenische Idee* (Paderborn, 1911); Jebb, *The Attic Orators* (London, 1893), pp. 148-214.

²*Ibid.*, p. 13.

inducing the Greeks to lay aside their quarrels with each other, and to unite in some common cause and Isocrates conceived that there was but one cause which could so unite them--war against Persia.¹

Demosthenes² too had a plan which was in some respects similar to that of Isocrates although it was changed as a result of the changed political situation. Dobson gives a brief summary:

In the Chersonese Demosthenes had suggested the dispatch of numerous embassies; he now enlarges on this topic; the interests of Athens must be identified with those of all Greece, and all States must be made to realize this. Philip's designs are against Greece as a whole; Athens must arm and put herself at the head of a great league in the struggle for freedom.³

Demosthenes is not particularly pertinent to our purpose here: his life and his plan are both much later than the period into which the material of tragedy falls; further, inasmuch as his idea was mainly an alliance in the face of an immanent danger, it more closely resembles such leagues as the Delian rather than true Panhellenic union. Aristophanes and Isocrates are, however, all-important: their writings show that during a part of the fifth and fourth centuries some men of the time were thinking of a united Greece and working towards it. In practice, to be sure, their advice was unheeded and their work futile. The cause of Panhellenism was a lost one.

The present study is an inquiry into the prevalence of this desire for national unity as it appears in Greek tragedy. Although perhaps any attempt to discover how strong and pervasive Panhellenic sentiment was, will little influence the general broad interpretation of Greek history,⁴ such a study will throw additional light on one of the chief causes for the decline of Greece to the position of a vassal-state. On the other hand, just as

¹Ibid., p. 17.

²Demosthenes' Panhellenic idea is most clearly expressed in his Third Philippic (secs. 70 ff.). Discussions will be found in Schafer, Demosthenes und seine Zeit (2d ed.; Leipzig, 1885), II, 478-9; Blass, Die Attische Beredsamkeit (2d ed.; Leipzig, 1893), III, 1, 375 ff.; G. A. and W. H. Simcox, On the Practical Politics of the Age of Demosthenes (Oxford, 1872), pp. lxxvii-xciii.

³The Greek Orators (London, 1819), p. 216.

⁴E. L. Hettich, A Study in Ancient Nationalism; the Testimony of Euripides (The Bayard Press, 1933), p. 15.

tragedy may shed light on the political question, so, conversely, the findings in regard to politics may illumine tragedy. From our other sources we know that the feeling for Panhellenic union was "in the air." Does it appear in tragedy?

The leading tragic poets especially exercised a most profound influence upon the national mind and character. They were the teachers of the people. Their writings were invested with a sort of Homeric sanctity, and appealed to as authorities on questions of science and morality. . . . Many passages in Plato and Aristotle prove the enormous influence for good and evil which was exercised by the Greek tragic poets.¹

If the poets were teachers of science and morality, were they also teachers of political theory? The present study should lead us to certain conclusions in this regard.

For the investigation of Panhellenic sentiment tragedy offers in some ways a remarkable field. Our extant plays cover the period from the glorious days of Marathon and Salamis to the dark night which settled down on Greece at the close of the Peloponnesian War. In the early part, we are close to a partial union against a common foe; at the end we are in the midst of the longest and bitterest strife of Greek with Greek. In the repulse of Persia the Greeks saw, on a small scale at least, the strength which union gave; during the Peloponnesian War, they had full opportunity to appreciate the horrors of mutual strife. The tragedies, produced as they were from year to year, can reflect the changes in feeling which the turn of events caused. A truce, a victory, a defeat, a new ally, all these must have swayed public opinion back and forth from local patriotism to true nationalism. The tragedies, if they reflect public opinion on political matters, will thus give us a view of these changes, not in static cross-section but in panorama.

Our evidence is drawn not from one author only but from several. In the three great tragedians alone, the sources of most of our extant material, we have three distinct personalities who represent politically, no less than dramatically and religiously, three distinct phases in the development of Athens. Aeschylus lived through the time of Marathon and probably saw Salamis personally.² He was the representative of the victors of

¹Haigh, The Attic Theatre (3d ed.; Oxford, 1907), pp. 4-5.

²Schol. Med. on Aesch. Persians 431.

Marathon,¹ the men who drove back the Great King. Sophocles may be considered the voice of Athens under Pericles, in the period of her rise to greatness. Euripides wrote under the shadow of the Peloponnesian War, of oligarchy, and of defeat.

Nor are these authors fanatics or reformers, preaching a doctrine which they alone believed and which they were trying to force upon their listeners. Rather, they were competing for a prize, the winning of which was probably their chief aim.² Now although the prize was awarded by a group of judges, the reaction of the audience probably influenced the judges to a great extent.³ Consequently, the poets aimed to produce plays that would please their audiences, and this they could best do by expressing opinions with which the audience was in sympathy. In short then, the opinions which the poets express, must, to a large degree, reflect public opinion or at least the opinion of a considerable minority.

On the other hand, the evidence of tragedy does present some difficulties. The chief of these is the old puzzle of how to evaluate dramatic evidence. That is, how far do the speeches of the play represent simply what the author thought appropriate to put in the mouth of a character in the plot situation; or how much represents the author's personal views? In other words, are the sentiments expressed those of the character as character, or those of the character as mouthpiece for the author? Scholars once thought that Euripides was a misogynist because of the dramatically appropriate tirades against women which he put in his plays. May we not fall into the same error if we infer from a speech suggesting Greek union that the author rather than merely the character is speaking?

The only answer to the problem is critical judgment. Some cases are probably examples of dramatically appropriate speeches; others may be true expressions of opinions of the poet and the Athenians of his time. We must decide for ourselves. Three criteria will assist us in passing judgment. First, do

¹Arist. Acharnians 697-98.

²R. C. Flickinger, The Greek Theater and Its Drama (University of Chicago Press, 1926), p. xvii.

³R. J. Bonner, Aspects of Athenian Democracy (University of California Press, 1933), pp. 120-31.

certain statements receive more emphasis than the dramatic situation demands? Is the emphasis so ill-placed in regard to dramatic necessity that the allusions definitely seem to be "dragged in"? Second, are these expressions of nationalism closely linked with political events which we know were taking place at the time? Third, do we find similar statements in the other literature of the period? When the examples of nationalistic sentiment are studied under the application of these rules and certain others which will apply in particular instances, those speeches which are not merely speeches but real expressions of opinion should emerge.

Another difficulty is that our extant tragedy is Attic tragedy. As a result, we gain only the Athenian viewpoint upon the question of nationalism, not that of all the Greeks. Since our knowledge of the events of this period comes for the most part from Attic or nearly Attic sources, our view on the present topic would be no more biased than it is in the consideration of other questions were it not for one fact. That fact is the Athenian empire. The years in which our extant plays were produced are those very years in which the Athenian empire waxed and waned. While Athenian control of the Greek world was still a possibility, that thought must have been in the mind of every Athenian, including the tragic poets. To be sure, Aristophanes, under the same influence, preached Panhellenism and won prizes. On the other hand, the political outlook brought about by the existence of the Athenian empire may have had two results. First, as far as the majority of the citizens was concerned, the glories and profits of imperialism may have completely obscured the advantages of Panhellenism. Second, perhaps Panhellenism was not lost in the imperialistic ideal but rather blended with it. That is, the unification of the Greek peoples will take place, but it will come about through the domination of Athens. Here too a decision can be reached only by examination of the evidence.

In summary, the situation confronting us is as follows. The Greeks were a united yet divided people. Knit together by many common bonds, they were sundered by local loyalties. Although they saw the advantages of union, they refused to accept all its consequences. The struggle was between unity and individuality. This study collects, analyzes, and attempts to explain the evidence for about one century of this conflict as a great literary form, tragedy, portrays it.

CHAPTER II
PANHELLENIC STATEMENTS IN THE PLAYS

In Greece of the fifth century, two distinct degrees or types of Panhellenism existed. The first type was Panhellenic consciousness: the realization on the part of the Hellenes that they were part of one great group, bound together by ties of blood, language, religion, and institutions. Evidence for this kind of Panhellenic sentiment is common in all the tragedy of the period. On the other hand, this appreciation of relationship united the Greeks in only a very loose tie. It did not prevent local isolation or self-satisfaction, nor did it stop inter-Hellenic hatred and slaughter.

Panhellenism of the second type was of a more advanced sort. From this point of view, the mere recognition of the existence of fellow-Greeks was not enough. It aimed at the prevention of internal dissention and strife. If they were all Hellenes, they should treat each other as Hellenes and brothers. They should not have kindly feelings towards each other only when they recalled the legendary cooperation against Troy or when they remembered the historical repulse of Persia. Nor should they recognize their position as members of a group only when they visited the common shrines of the gods at Delphi or elsewhere, or attended the great Hellenic games. On the contrary, the higher degree of Panhellenism sought an "every-day" appreciation and practice of this group consciousness, particularly in the field of actual political relationships. If the Greeks were members of one great clan, jealousy and strife within this body were to be deplored. The Greek states should operate as members of a family.¹ For the Greeks, no crime was greater than the murder of a kinsman. Consequently, if the concept of the family were extended from the individual family to the great "Hellenic family," strife and slaughter between Greeks would be as serious an offense as they were between members of a household. Athens, Sparta, Thebes,

¹Aesch. S. T. 681-82.

Argos and the lesser cities would then no longer hate each other so bitterly or war against each other so cruelly as they did against a barbarian foe. Rather, just as the tie of the family placed certain restrictions and obligations on the individual citizen, so would the practical recognition of Panhellenic unity regulate the activity of each city. Their inter-Hellenic dealings would then be carried on with fraternal moderation and mutual willingness to compromise. In that event, in the same way as individualism among the ancient Greeks was lost in the family, so would local pride and patriotism, with their narrow hates, hopes, and fears, be merged in Panhellenic pride and patriotism. Of this second type of Panhellenism we find little or no trace in tragedy.

The possibility existed, of course, for a third and still more highly developed concept of Greek unity, the organization of a Greek nation. But aside from a single reference to the Amphictyonic League, the nearest actual approach of the Greeks to practical Panhellenism on an organized basis, the tragedies advocate no political systems embodying Panhellenic ideals.

The first two classes of Panhellenism, the mere group-consciousness and a limited practical application of it, do appear in tragedy, and the following pages present the evidence.

The mere consciousness of Greek unity has left many traces in the remains of the tragic corpus. In fostering the feeling of kinship, the existence of a common name for the group, "Hellenes," and for the territory in which they dwelt, "Hellas," was of prime importance. As was mentioned in the preceding chapter, at an early period of Greek history no such common name existed. Homer knew only the local groups, Argives, Achaeans, Hellenes, and others; consequently, when he wished to include the entire host before Troy, he enlarged the proper meaning of any one of these specific names. But, as has been mentioned, "Hellenes," as a general term outstripped the others in popularity; and by the time of the first extant play of Aeschylus, and thence over the whole period of tragedy, Ἕλληνας means "Greeks" and not simply "those from Phthiotis."

Consequently, whenever the "Greeks" are meant in tragedy, the usual word is Ἕλληνας, and this designation appears throughout all the plays. The instances are, of course, numerous, and the mere occurrences of the word are easily found in any index. Certain examples are, however, particularly interesting for the

present study and may well be quoted for illustration. An especially note-worthy example is the war-cry of the Greeks at Salamis as related by Aeschylus:

On, ye sons of Hellas! Free your native land, free
your children, your wives, the fanes of your fathers'
gods, and the tombs of your ancestors. Now you battle
for your all.¹

Salamis was one of the few examples of concerted action on the part of the Greeks. In the presence of an invading barbarian, the two great cities, Athens and Sparta, with lesser allies had leagued together. On this occasion, as only too rarely in Greek history, the Greeks were not fighting only their fellow-Greeks and were not urged to battle as "men of Athens" or "Spartans." The force, made up of the states loyal to Greek freedom, was a truly Hellenic one. If the effort was Hellenic, so was the renown of victory:

For when some god had given the glory to the Hellenes
in the battle on the sea.²

Sophocles too has several good examples of the definite use of the terms "Greek" and "Greece." In referring to the army against Troy he uses the contemporary rather than the Homeric designation to include the entire force:

Would he had sunk to hell, or vanished in ether afar,
Who first admonished the Greeks to league themselves for war.³

He describes Agamemnon as:

King of men
Who led the hosts of Hellas.⁴

In the Philoctetes the Greeks declare their nationality by the simple statement:

We are Greeks.⁵

¹Aesch. Pers. 402-5.

²Ibid. 454-55. For further examples of this use in Aeschylus, cf. Pers. 234, "all Hellas"; Pers. 338-9, of the number of the Greek ships; Pers. 758, "the Hellenes' land"; Eum. 31, "anyone from among the Hellenes"; Eum. 756, "one of the Hellenes"; Eum. 920, "the gods of Hellas." This list and similar ones following are not intended to be exhaustive indices of every occurrence of the special word or concept. They are only those examples of definitely Panhellenic force which are, however, either less striking than those illustrations included in the text or else repetitions of them.

³Soph. Ajax 1193-96.

⁴Soph. Elec. 694-95.

⁵Soph. Phil. 233. Cf. also Ajax 458, "the army of the Hellenes"; Ajax 1191, "the reproach of Hellas"; Ajax 1363, "in the

Euripides, partially because his work represents the great bulk of surviving tragedy, furnishes more examples than the two other poets. He speaks of Achilles as one

Who died for Hellas nobly as man may.¹

The children of Heracles say of the Athenians:

In all the peopled breadth
Of Hellas, these alone have championed us.²

Orestes pleads in his defence his religious service to the land:

Hear how, in that for which thou threatenest doom
Of stoning, I to all Greece rendered service.³

In the Iphigenia at Aulis Euripides produced an almost Panhellenic play. As a result, several examples of striking uses of the words "Greek" and "Greece" appear. The heroine feels that hers is a national responsibility:

Unto me all mighty Hellas looks.⁴

Consequently, when she sacrifices herself, her offering is for all of Greece.

My body unto Hellas I resign,
Sacrifice me, raze Troy; for this through all the ages is
My memorial: children, marriage, glory--all are one in this.⁵

And for my country's sake my body give,
And for all Hellas.⁶

In this play the poet twice makes use of the unusual word Πανελλήνιος which neither of the other dramatists employs.

ὥς δ' ἐς Ἀυλὶν ἤλθεις αὔθις ὡς Πανελλήνιων στρατός⁷

ὦ Πανελλήνιων ἀναξ.⁸

As the preceding examples show, in tragedy the usual designation of the Greeks was Ἕλληνες. The Homeric usage did

eyes of all Hellenes"; Elec. 483, "lord of the Hellenes"; Elec. 531, "alone with the Greeks"; O.C. 597, "everyone of the Hellenes"; Phil. 3, "the noblest of the Grecian host"; Phil. 1344, "one best of the Greeks"; Trach. 1011, "of all the Greeks most unjust."

¹Eur. Hec. 310.

²Herac. 305-306.

³Or. 564-65.

⁴I.A. 1378.

⁵I.A. 1397-99.

⁶I.A. 1554-55.

⁷I.A. 350.

⁸I.A. 414. Cf. also, Bac. 23, "of all Hellas"; Herac. 151, "all this Hellas"; Hipp. 1120, "in Hellas-land"; I.A. 308, 1386, "to all Greeks"; Or. 250, "through Hellas"; Or. 1134, "on behalf of all Greece"; Tro. 926, "to vanquish Hellas"; Tro. 932, "this boon to Greece."

not, however, die out completely in tragedy. Tragic diction, particularly in its early years, was under the influence of epic. Consequently, the use of "Achaeans" and the like for "Greeks" is not uncommon. This usage is found in later tragedy also, especially in the plays of the "Trojan Cycle," perhaps as a conscious echo of the Homeric speech.

Moreover, in the tragic fragments we find traces of another name for the Greeks, Γραικες. This word appears in Sophocles twice; once in its usual form Γραικες,¹ and once in the form it assumed supposedly among the non-Greek peoples who were unable to pronounce the initial consonant combination, Ραικοί.²

If this common designation for both people and land gave the Greeks a feeling of unity, it also served to mark off sharply those who could not be included under that classification. These non-Hellenic peoples, notably the Persians, the Egyptians, and, generally, the Trojans, are all classed together as "barbarians." Although this distinction between "Greek" and "barbarian" is, of course, borne out by nearly all the examples to be cited, certain collocations of these terms set them off in marked contrast. Sometimes, the distinction is simple:

Such as none of mankind hath either among
the Scythians or in Pelop's realm.³

Neither Grecian nor barbarian.⁴

And through all Asia, by the briny sea
Lying with stately towered cities thronged,
Peopled with Hellenes blent with aliens.⁵

Yet is the fashion of his vesture Greek;
But deeds of a barbarian hand are these.⁶

Hellene or alien, with their mailed array.⁷

First, then in Hellas dwell'st thou in the stead
of land barbaric.⁸

Now ruin seize thee!—clear I see, who saw not
Then, when from halls and land barbarian
To a Greek home I bare thee, utter bane.⁹

What Hellene; or alien.¹⁰

¹Soph., frag. 475.

³Aesch. Eum. 702-3.

⁵Eur. Bac. 17-19.

⁷Eur. I.A. 65.

⁹Ibid., 1329-31.

²Soph., frag. 983.

⁴Soph. Trach. 1060.

⁶Eur. Herac. 130-31.

⁸Eur. Med. 536-37.

¹⁰Eur. Phoen. 1509.

Generally, however, the comparison contains an element of contempt, either expressed or implied. The barbarian is in no way the equal of the Greek. He is a coward, a lover of effeminate luxury, a political slave.

For a barbarian that has to do with Hellenes,
thou waxest over-proud.¹

The whole barbarian race is avaricious.²

Hector is not here,
Nor Priam, nor his gold: a Greek town this.³

Suchlike is the whole barbaric race:--
Father with daughter, son with mother weds,
Sister with brother: kin the nearest wade
Through blood: their laws forbid no whit thereof.
Bring not such things midst us. We count it shame
That o'er two wives one man hold wedlock's reins.⁴

Barbarian chattel! Stubborn impudence.⁵

Villain of villains, when, when could thy race,
Thy brute race, be friend unto the Greeks?
Never.⁶

For midst barbarians all are slaves save one.⁷

PHRYG. Crouching to thee in barbaric wise I grovel,
O my lord.

OR. Out! No Ilium this is, but the land of Argos
spreads hereby.⁸

On behalf of all the army of the Greeks it is shameful for me to keep silent, but let a barbarian speak.⁹

Since the Greeks thus scored the barbarians, the Greeks thought it a great shame that they should ever be under barbarian rule.

If my child bear no son, this woman's brood
Grow up, wilt thou establish these as lords
Of Phthia-land?--shall they, barbarians born,
Rule Greeks?¹⁰

Right it is that Hellenes rule barbarians,
not that alien yoke
Rest on Hellas, mother. They are bondmen,
we be freeborn folk.¹¹

¹Aesch. Supp. 914.

²Soph. frag. 528.

³Eur. And. 168-69.

⁴Ibid., 173-78.

⁵Ibid., 261.

⁶Eur. Hec. 1199-1202.

⁷Eur. Hel. 276.

⁸Eur. Or. 1507-1508.

⁹Eur. frag. 796.

¹⁰Eur. And. 663-66.

¹¹Eur. I.A. 1400-1401.

Never, I ween, would Hera or the Maid,
Pallas, have stooped unto such Folly's depth,
That Hera would to aliens Argos sell,
Or Pallas bow 'neath Phrygiens Athens' neck.¹

Being Greeks shall we be slaves to barbarians?²

If the above citations are read in their complete contexts, one sees that many of these references are to Trojans, who were, to be sure, generally classed as barbarians. The Trojans represented, however, a "border-line" case. The Homeric tradition had pictured them as worshipping the same gods as the Greeks with similar rites, as speaking Greek, and as following Greek customs in many ways.³ As a result, some room for doubt existed. Of this uncertainty Euripides furnishes the best example.

Trojan nor Greek, nor barbarian,
Might ever boast her mother of such as these.⁴

On the other hand, continual friction with Persia during the great era of tragedy led to such contempt and hatred of non-Hellenic peoples that usually the Trojans are classed as barbarians. Possibly the reason for this classification was that in the plays drawn from the Trojan Cycle taunts and jeers at the Trojans as barbarians could and would be understood by the audience as directed at The Barbarians, the Persians.

These examples should be sufficient to show the intensity of the Panhellenic consciousness reflected in tragedy simply through the use of the name for the Hellenic group. But the assignment of the name, "Hellenes," was not the cause of the group-distinction but the result of it. As stated in the previous chapter, the classification was based on certain definite criteria. The Greeks formed a group because they all possessed certain similar characteristics and likenesses. The first of these common bonds mentioned by Herodotus⁵ is common blood or race.

As a result of modern anthropological research, the term race has for us a much less general implication than it did for students of a hundred years ago. Until the present century, the term race, which we now apply only on the basis of definite physical characteristics, was often confused with nationality or language. According to modern usage, the expression, "Greek race," is meaningless and impossible. Even in the Homeric period, the

¹Eur. Tro. 971-4.

²Eur. frag. 719.

³CAH, II, 487 ff.

⁴Eur. Tro. 477-78.

⁵viii, 144.

Greeks were a mixture of peoples; whether they were a mixture of races we do not know. As to the results of invasion and migration at a later period, we know still less. For the ancient Greeks, "race," in our sense of the word, may well have differentiated them from other peoples with marked physical characteristics such as the Egyptians. In this fashion King Pelasgus decides that the daughters of Danaus must be of another race, although in their case the distinguishing feature may be no more than a good coat of tan.

Stranger maidens, your tale passeth my belief--how this race [*yéves*] of yours can be of Argos. Nay, for ye are rather more like to women of Libya and in no wise to natives of this land. The Nile too might foster such a stock, and like unto yours is the Cyprians impress stamped upon female forms by male artificers. And of such aspect, I have heard, are nomad women, who, pillion-borne, ride on steed-like camels, women dwelling in a land neighboring the Aethiopians.¹

From this passage alone we might doubt whether the King was impressed by more than their strange garments; but later in the play the maidens themselves comment on their own appearance in a way which seems to put emphasis on physical characteristics:

The nature of our aspect is unlike yours--for Nile and Inachus rear a different race [*yéves*].²

This much evidence exists for race, in our sense of the word. But for the Greeks, race had another meaning. Aeschylus again furnishes the example.

I dreamed that two women in fair vesture, one apparelled in Persian garb, the other in Dorian attire, appeared before mine eyes; both in stature far more striking than are the women of our time, in beauty flawless, sisters of the selfsame race [*yévous*]. As for the country in which they dwelt, to one has been assigned by lot the land of Hellas, to the other that of the barbarians.³

Here the "sisters of the selfsame race" are, of course, the Greeks of the mainland of Greece and those of the island and Asia minor. By race, the poet means the same as did most of the Greeks, exactly what Herodotus meant by "common blood."

The Greeks thought of themselves as Dorians, Ionians, and the like. They were acutely conscious that their group contained small divisions, and these smaller units presented a problem of

¹Aesch. Supp. 277-86.

²Ibid., 497-98.

³Aesch. Pers. 181-87.

how to explain them historically. With what might perhaps be called the usual directness, the Greeks solved the problem of general relationship by fashioning a literal relationship by blood, and by giving each of these groups a common ancestor from whom it might take its name. Hence the Dorians are the descendents of Dorus. That theory of actual kinship then welds them together. In like manner, the Ionians have a common ancestor, Ion. Then, if this same genealogical theory makes Ion and Dorus brothers, not only are the two units united in themselves, but both are joined in the tradition of common ancestry. This theory of common ancestors in the remote past was very real to the Greeks and this tradition is probably what Herodotus had in mind. Considerable evidence, some of rather vague sort, for this feeling occurs throughout tragedy. The genealogies in which all the plays abound--from the rather brief ones in Aeschylus' earliest extant work to the long lineage boasted by many of Euripides' characters--all are Panhellenic to this extent: through a common ancestor, even though very remote and perhaps recognized as fictitious, the parts of the Greek people gained a feeling of unity. For example, the most important of these genealogies, taken from a play which had to do with one of these mythical ancestors, Ion, will serve:

Take this thy son and go to Cecrop's land,
 Creusa, and on thrones of sovereignty
 Seat him; for, of Erechtheus' lineage sprung,
 Worthy he is to rule o'er mine own land.
 Famed shall he be through Hellas; for the sons
 Born to him, even four from this one root,
 Shall give their names unto several tribes
 Of the land's folk which dwell upon mine hill.
 Geleon the first shall be; the second tribe
 Hopletes; Argades the third; the fourth
 One tribe, of my shield named Aegicores.
 And their sons in the fulness of the time
 Shall found them cities in the Cyclad Isles,
 And sea-board realms, for strength unto my land.
 Yea, they shall people either mainlands plains
 On either side the strait, of Asia's land
 And Europe: and because of thy son's name
 Ionians shall be named and win renown.
 From Xuthus too and thee a seed shall spring,
 Dorus, of whom shall Doris song-renowned
 Arise; the second goeth to Pelops' land,
 Achaeus; o'er the seaboard shall he reign
 Nigh Rhion, and the people of his name
 Among the nations shall be sealed therewith.¹

The common language was another great bond noted by

¹Eur. Ion 1571-94.

Herodotus. Although the language had many dialects, some of which varied extremely from the norm, nevertheless, a speaker of one dialect clearly recognized the speaker of another as also speaking Greek and probably could, in most cases, understand him.¹ For most of the Greeks of the period, to speak Greek as a native language was, with certain exceptions of course, to be Greek. Difference in language was an obvious difference, even to the unthinking or uncultivated, which marked the Greeks off from their non-Hellenic neighbors in the intercourse of daily life. In fact, the common language was a great bond of union, not only because of the group consciousness which it fostered, but because of the social and commercial relations which it promoted. The evidence offered on these points is fairly complete.

Sometimes language was of assistance in determining whether strangers were Greeks; so Philoctetes desires the new arrivals to his lonely abode to speak:

If I
Might make conjecture by your garb and mien
Ye are Greeks--a sight most welcome to my eyes;
But I would hear your voices [$\phi\omega\nu\alpha\iota\varsigma$].²

When two hostile armies were near, language served as a means of identification particularly when darkness hindered the recognition of visual signs. So the Trojan shepherds listened

Till accents fell upon our ears
Of no Greek tongue, and so we ceased from dread.³

In one case, a city claims the special attention of the gods of Hellas because of its language:

Do not, I entreat ye, extirpate in ruin utter
and complete, with ravage by the foe, a city
that speaks the speech of Hellas.⁴

The possibility that Greek and barbarian might have difficulty in understanding each other is well brought out in the scene between Cassandra and Clytemnestra in the Agamemnon. When Clytemnestra appears to summon the slave within, she feels confident at first that she will understand her,

¹C. D. Buck, CJ, I (1905-1906), 104 ff.; R. J. Bonner, CJ, IV (1908-1909), 356 ff. The scenes of comedy in which foreigners appear, as in the Acharnians, could have been humorous only if the audience could understand the dialects.

²Soph. Phil. 223-25.

³Eur. Rhes. 294-95.

⁴Aesch. S.T. 71-73.

. . . . if her speech be not strange and outlandish [*ἀγνώρα φωνήν βάρβαρον*] even as a swallows.¹
 But, as her remarks arouse no response in Cassandra, the queen senses the possible linguistic difficulty and falls back upon sign-language:

But if, failing to understand, thou doest not catch my meaning, then, instead of speech, make sign with thy barbarian hand.²

If the Greeks looked with scorn upon the barbarians in other respects, they also had contempt for their language. Hence, Agamemnon, when he wishes to be particularly insulting to Teucer, says:

I understand not a barbarian tongue.³

In fact, not to speak Greek was really not to speak at all and *ἀγλωσσος* meant "barbarian" in contrast to "Greek."⁴ As the daughters of Danaus remark:

All the world is ready to cast reproach on those who speak a foreign tongue.⁵

In all the tragedies, the barbarians rather than the Greeks seem conscious of linguistic differences.

I invoke the grace of Apia's land of hills (for well, O land, thou canst understand my barbarous speech).⁶

Ilion, Ilion, woe is me!
 Phrygian city, and mount Idean
 Holy and fertile, I wail for thee
 In the chariot-paeon, the chariot-paeon,
 With cry barbaric.⁷

The Linus-lay--O the Linus-lay!--
 Death's prelude chanted, well-a-day,
 Of barbarian folk in their Asian tongue.⁸

Your Tyrian accents ringing clear.⁹

With my alien chant upflung
 And with prayers of an alien tongue.¹⁰

¹Aesch. *Ag.* 1050-51.

²*Ibid.*, 1060-66. This procedure is, however, unnecessary for Cassandra says later, "And yet all too well I know the speech of Hellas" (*ibid.*, 1254).

³Soph. *Ajax* 1263.

⁴Cf. Soph. *Trach.* 1060. Also A. C. Pearson, *The Fragments of Sophocles* (Cambridge, 1917), I, 14, frag. 17.

⁵Aesch. *Supp.* 972-73.

⁶*Ibid.*, 117-19.

⁷Eur. *Or.* 1381-85.

⁸*Ibid.*, 1395-97.

⁹Eur. *Phoen.* 301

¹⁰*Ibid.*, 679-680.

Perhaps the reason for this comment by the barbarians that they are speaking a strange language is to be found in the fact that there is no attempt at linguistic realism; that is, the characters do not speak their proper language or dialect. Despite these protestations, the barbarians speak Greek as fluently as any character. Aside from the "lyrical Doric" the language is, except for some Homeric usages, Attic Greek. This situation is quite different from that of comedy where Persian and several of the Greek dialects are spoken on the stage.¹ Perhaps this emphasis on the part of the barbarians that they are speaking a foreign tongue is simply a sort of tragic convention to give the impression of linguistic difference without breaking the flow of language by the introduction of the actual dialect.

On the other hand, Sophocles may have once attempted linguistic realism. In his lost play, the *Ποιμένες*, incidentally the same work to which is attributed the rather rare word already cited *Γραικες*,² and perhaps the unassigned fragment, *Ραικοί*,³ Sextus Empiricus states⁴ that the poet used the Phrygian *βαλλίν* for the Attic *βασιλεῦ*.⁵ So far as I know, this example is the only instance in Attic tragedy of the use of a foreign language as part of the characterization of a speaker or as an attempt at local color.

Closely related with the common language was another bond which united the Greeks, the literature which that language produced. The literary men of the fifth century depended on no local public, but were certain of an audience throughout the entire Greek world. For proof of this widespread Greek interest in the national literature we have only to note the frequency with which Herodotus quotes Homer⁶ and the other poets,⁷ or the story of Plutarch, who tells⁸ how the Athenian soldiers, escaping from the disaster of Syracuse, made themselves welcome in the cities of

¹Aesch. S.T. 169-170 and *Choeph.* 561-62 both refer to the Greek dialects but the poet makes no attempt to reproduce them in the plays.

²Soph. frag. 475.

³*Ibid.*, 983.

⁴672. 26.

⁵Soph. frag. 472.

⁶W. How and J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus* (Oxford, 1912), Vol. 1, p. 21, n. 1.

⁷*Ibid.*, n. 2.

⁸*Nicias* xxix.

Sicily by reciting odes of Euripides which had not yet reached the "provinces."

Of greater importance than this interest in "contemporary" literature was the high position held by the Homeric poems. Every Greek from Trebizond to Marseilles knew Homer; and his writings held a unique position because, while they formed a great national epic, they possessed an interest far exceeding that due them only as a literary classic. They were religious works in that they contained a wealth of material about the Greek pantheon. They were histories of the Greek people so respected that centuries after their composition land claims might be based on them.¹ They were sourcebooks of genealogy, for from the heroes of that work and their descendants the noble families of Greece traced their lineage. In short, a literature so widely read and used could not fail to have a unifying effect.

In their subject matter, moreover, these poems contained a great Panhellenic influence. For the Greeks, the Trojan War represented the grand epoch in their history. The sack of Troy was a united and successful blow dealt by all the Greeks--who are duly set down in the second book of the Iliad--against the barbarians of the East. The Greeks themselves recognized the expedition against Troy as the first unifying force in their national life² and the extant tragedies contain some allusions to the war as such:

And a great boon bestowed she thus on Greece;
For they which were unschooled to arms and war
Turned them to brave deeds.³

Cypris prevails: this boon my bridal brought
To Greece--ye are not to foreign foes enthralled,
Nor battle-crushed, nor 'neath a despot bowed.⁴

Consequently, in so far as the tragic plots based on this war would remind the Greeks that at one time they made common cause together against the barbarian, the tragedies may have thus indirectly exercised some slight Panhellenic influence.

Another distinguishing mark of the Hellene was his dress. For the most part, the contrast lies between the simplicity of the Greek attire and the more luxurious apparel of the barbarians, particularly the Orientals. In the Suppliants, Aeschylus has

¹The Athenian claim to Salamis based on Iliad 11. 558. Aristotle Rhetoric 1. 15; J. A. Scott, The Unity of Homer (University of California Press, 1921), pp. 47-51, 58-61.

²Thuc. 1. 3.

³Eur. And. 681-83.

⁴Eur. Tro. 932-34.

drawn his heroines as barbarians in spite of their ultimately Argive origin. One passage of this play contains allusions to both their language and their dress.

I invoke the grace of Apia's land of hills (for well,
O land, thou canst understand my barbarous speech),
and oft, I lay my hand upon my Sidonian veil and
rend its linen into shreds.¹

In another passage of the same play, the Argive king gives good evidence as to the importance of dress in distinguishing between Hellenes and barbarians. On first seeing the suppliant maidens he says:

Whence hails this band we address, attired in
un-Hellenic garb and flaunting in barbaric robes
and fabric of close woof? For your apparel is
not that of the dames of Argos nor yet of any
part of Hellas.²

In the Philoctetes of Sophocles, the marooned hero immediately recognizes his visitors as Greeks by their dress:

If I
Might make conjecture by your garb and mien,
Ye are Greeks--a sight most welcome to my eyes.³

Sometimes the Greeks suffered as a result of their simple dress. Euripides twice suggests that Menelaus lost his wife as a result of Paris' sartorial perfection:

Him in barbaric bravery sawest thou
Gold-glittering, and thy senses were distraught.⁴

Gleaming with gold, barbaric bravery.⁵

In spite of the fact that Greek dress was the mark of a Greek, nevertheless, it was but an outward sign of a group distinguished more by mental and moral characteristics.

Yet is the fashion of his vesture Greek:
But deeds of a barbarian hand are these.⁶

The characteristics which particularly denoted the Greek were in many cases what he was wont to call "custom." In many instances, these observances were religious in origin and were based on definite concepts. These will be studied later individually. Certain others do not, however, fall into any definite category, but as a whole show a consciousness, on the part of both Greeks and barbarians, of a general scheme of manners in the

¹Aesch. Supp. 117-122.

²Ibid., 234-37.

³Soph. Phil. 223-24.

⁴Eur. Tro. 991-92.

⁵Eur. I.A. 74.

⁶Eur. Herac. 130-31.

Hellenic group.

Sophocles furnishes one example where the idea of a general code of Hellenic wont is present by implication:

Out on the twain! Their thoughts and actions all
Are framed and modelled on Egyptian ways.
For there the men sit at the looms indoors
While the wives slave abroad for daily bread.¹

Euripides refers to various matters:

Not from my sires such custom I received
That sires for sons should die: no Greek law this.²

We count it shame
That o'er two wives one man hold wedlock's reins.³

Ah me, what evil customs hold in Greece.⁴

HERM. We live not under laws barbaric here.
AND. There, even as here, shame waits on shameful things.⁵

First, then, in Hellas dwell'st thou, in the stead
Of land barbaric, knowest justice, learnest
To live by law without respect of force.⁶

TYND. Thou hast grown barbarian, midst barbarians long.
MEN. Greek still it is to honour kindred blood.⁷

He who on justice never turned an eye,
Nor to the common law of Greeks appealed?⁸

Woe's me!--then a sepulchre's servant I bare!
But what custom shall this be that Hellenes share,
Or what this statute?--O friend, declare.⁹

O Greeks who have found out cruelties un-Greek,
Why slay this child who is guiltless wholly of wrong?¹⁰

And I found fault with the custom of the Greeks.¹¹

Three are the virtues which you must practice,
my child: honor the gods, your parents, and
the common laws of Hellas.¹²

Of the common customs of the Greeks, the majority were religious in origin. Hence, these religious usages served to unite the Greeks because the religion which gave rise to them was, for the most part, national. The Greek pantheon, despite local cults with their particular divinities and rites, was worshipped in much the same fashion throughout Greece. Hence, religion offered a common ground for the unifying of the group.

¹Soph. O.C. 337-41.

²Alc. 683-84.

³And. 177-78.

⁴Ibid., 693.

⁵Ibid., 243-44.

⁶Med. 536-38.

⁷Or. 485-86.

⁸Ibid., 494-5.

⁹Tro. 265-67.

¹⁰Ibid., 764-65.

¹¹Eur. frag. 282, l. 13

¹²Ibid., 853.

As was the case in many other matters, in religion too the Greeks were conscious, not only that their own similar practices made them a group, but this distinction was heightened by their recognition that their gods and rites were not those of the surrounding peoples with whom they came in contact. In the scene of the Suppliants of Aeschylus between the Argive king and the Egyptian herald, a passage full of contrasts between Greek and barbarian, the king is quick to note that he is not dealing with a worshipper of his gods.

KING: For all thy notice to the gods, thou hast no
reverence to them.

HERALD: 'Tis the deities by the Nile that I revere.

KING: While ours are naught, as I understand from thee?¹

Sometimes this religious unity was brought out simply in the casual observations of daily life. The rude Hermes-statues before the houses must have been a familiar sight; they denoted the habitations of Greeks. Consequently, when the daughters of Danaus find themselves on Greek soil they remark:

Here too is Hermes, according to Hellenic wont.²

If the consciousness of religious unity was awakened by the sight of these simple shrines, how much more effective must have been the sentiment aroused by a view of the great temples, especially the beautiful temples and treasuries of the great Panhellenic religious centers. Euripides gives us a pleasing picture of a naïve band of pilgrim women realizing for the first time the religious unity of the Hellenes, when they visit Delphi:

Not in Athens alone then, the city divine,
Stand courts of the gods with line on line
Of stately columns; nor service is thine
There only, O highway-king.³

The prime reason for Delphi's importance as a religious

¹Aesch. Supp. 921-23. Compare a similar example in the Peace of Aristophanes:

TRYGAEUS: 'Tis that the Moon and vile immoral Sun
Have long been plotting to your hurt; and now
They're giving Hellas up to the Barbarians.

HERMES: Why are they doing that? TRYG: Because, by Zeus!
We sacrifice to you, but those Barbarians
Only to them. So naturally they
Are very anxious that we all should perish,
And they get all the rites of all the gods (406-413).

²Aesch. Supp. 220.

³Eur. Ion 183-86.

center was, of course, the oracle. The practice of consulting Delphi, and also the older oracular seat of Zeus at Dodona, was a thoroughly Greek trait; as a result, references to oracles are numerous in tragedy. One has only to remember the importance of an oracle in two stories, those of Oedipus and of Orestes, which were favorites as tragic plots, and the entire play, the Ion, which Euripides devoted to Delphi, to recognize the importance of this factor in Greek religious life. In tragedy, however, though the oracle is often mentioned, there is no suggestion that consulting it was a Panhellenic distinction.

In addition to Delphi's position as the richest shrine in Greece and the influence and popularity of its oracle, the precinct there gained further prominence through its practical use as a Panhellenic center. At Delphi the Greek cities set up accounts of their victories and copies of their treaties. Accordingly, we have, in one of the tragedies, a solemn oath entrusted to the Delphic god, not merely for preservation, but to secure the god's aid in punishing any infringement as well:

And in the tripod's hollow grave the oath.
Then give it to the Delphian god to guard,
Token of oaths and witness unto Hellas.¹

The equals of Delphi as religious centers were the great games,² particularly the Olympian games which were, more than the other three, thought of as Panhellenic.³ Not only did the general recognition of these games as Panhellenic through the proclamation of the sacred truce⁴ and the presence of contestants from all states make for group consciousness; but the mere gathering of the spectators, who were kept isolated for various reasons during the rest of the time, offered an opportunity for peaceful conversation and association. Our sources tell us a little of the political consequences of these gatherings.⁵ As to how much the personal viewpoint of the spectators was affected, we must use our imaginations.

¹Eur. Supp. 1202-4.

²CAH, II, 641.

³E. N. Gardiner, Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals (London, 1910), pp. 60-61.

⁴Thuc. v. 49; viii. 9-10; Xen. Hell. iv. 7. 1-7.

⁵Thuc. iii. 8 ff.

In tragedy the games appear with a rarity which is surprising if we consider their importance in the eyes of the Greeks. For this state of affairs, the type of plot favored by tragedy was doubtless somewhat responsible. Yet from two references to the games, we can get some idea of their importance. Sophocles once mentions the games at which Orestes was supposedly killed:

To the great festival of Greece he went,
The Delphian Games.¹

Here, the space which the poet devotes, in the messenger's speech which follows, to a "play-by-play" account of the race shows the interest which he knew his audience would have in the description. Euripides too speaks of the games and makes his Hippolytus declare:

Fain would I foremost victor be in games
Hellenic, and be second in the realm.²

Out of this unity of religious beliefs and observances arose a series of religious customs and observances which were generally recognized as characterizing the Greeks. Of these rites the importance of proper burial for the dead is probably the one most evident in tragedy. Even the barbarians were acquainted with this phase of Hellenic custom. In the Helen, the barbarian king of Egypt, although he is ignorant of the exact details of Hellenic burial ceremonies, implies that he knows of their existence. When Helen exclaims:

'Tis Hellene wont, whose is lost at sea--³

the king interrupts to ask:

To do what? Wise are Pelops' sons therein.⁴

How then? Of Hellene wont I nothing know.⁵

After the rites are explained to him, he is curious to learn the reason:

Now wherefore? Why doth Greece observe this use?⁶

Although Helen gives him a fictitious account, the king accepts her statement as valid since he appears to have heard something of Greek ideas of burial.

The entire incident of the Helen is, of course, a strategem to deceive a barbarian villain and the rites carried out were not Greek custom. Hence, the evidence of that play is valuable only

¹Soph. Elec. 681-82.

²Eur. Hipp. 1016-17.

³Eur. Helen 1241. Cf. also her statement in 1065-66.

⁴Ibid., 1242.

⁵Ibid., 1246.

⁶Ibid., 1270.

in so far as it shows the general recognition of Greek burial practices.

On the other hand, the emphasis laid by the Greeks themselves on proper burial ceremonies runs through many of the plays. The entire story of *Antigone*, for example, is based on this idea. Were not proper rites for the dead of greatest importance, the girl would have no excuse for violating the king's edict.

The Panhellenic nature of this practice is, however, best brought out in the Suppliants of Euripides, a play based on the necessity for proper burial. Frequent references show clearly that to deny burial was to transgress Greek religious custom and to be a barbarian.

Therefore I fear not to exhort thee, son,
That thou wouldst lay thy strong constraining hand
On men of violence which refuse the dead
The dues of burial and of funeral rites,
And quell the folk that would confound all wont
Of Hellas.¹

But lifeless bodies--harming not your state,
Nor thrusting man-destroying strife on her--
I claim to bury: lo, all Hellas' law
Do I uphold.²

Dost think thou woundest Argos through her dead?
Not so: the common cause of Greece is this.³

Never to Greeks shall it be said, that when
It fell to me and Athens to uphold
Heaven's ancient law, that law was set at naught.⁴

Hearken--we come but for the corpses' sake,
To bury them, and keep all Hellas' law
inviolated.⁵

As has already been mentioned in passing, the slaying of kinsmen was an abomination to the Greeks; such bloodshed caused a stain which was hard to cleanse. The dilemma presented by the need for revenge in the face of being found guilty of the identical crime was in the *Orestes*-theme a favorite subject for Greek tragedy. Euripides gives us the only instance in which the Hellenic nature of this idea is expressly stated. In the Orestes Tyndaris reproaches Menelaus:

Thou has grown barbarian, midst barbarians long.⁶
To this taunt Menelaus replies:

¹Eur. Supp. 307-12.

²Ibid., 524-27.

³Ibid., 537-38.

⁴Ibid., 561-63.

⁵Ibid., 670-72.

⁶Eur. Or. 485.

Greek is it still to honour kindred blood.¹
Such an attitude is Greek. Among the barbarians

Kin the nearest wade
Through blood: their laws forbid no whit thereof.²

Another of the Greek customs closely connected with religious thought was the inviolability of the suppliant and the necessity of granting his request. Many of the plays contain examples of supplication; even in our small extant corpus two of the plays, in action as well as title, are directly concerned with formal entreaty. In one instance we have an allusion to the practice as well known in Greece:

And yet, 'tis true, I see that boughs such as suppliants
bear are laid by your side before the god assembled here--
only as to this can Hellas make guess with confidence.³

As to the inviolability of the suppliant, one fragment shows the religious element behind the concept:

Slay not. For it is not right [θέμις] to slay the suppliant.⁴

The treatment of the suppliant was closely related to that of the guest-friend. Just as the one was under the special protection of Zeus *ἱεστήριος* so the other was the ward of Zeus *ξένιος*. To offer hospitality to the guest was a usual Greek custom. Hence, such a statement as,

Athens is held of states the most devout,
Athens alone gives hospitality
And shelters the vexed stranger, so men say.⁵

is, of course, exaggeration. This portrayal of Athens as the sanctuary of the oppressed is simply one of the more common means used to tickle the vanity of the audience before which the play was produced. Such glorification will be discussed later.⁶ As for hospitality, the reception of the guest-friend was truly a Hellenic practice. In so much as the connection with Greek religion was very close, the usage did not necessarily prevail outside of Greece. Consequently, the Greeks, while spurning for themselves the idea of mistreating a guest, for

Who honors the guest-deceiving man?⁷
fully realized that the barbarians might not have the same qualms:

¹Ibid., 486.

²Eur. *And.* 175-76.

³Aesch. *Supp.* 241-43.

⁴Eur. frag. 937.

⁵Soph. *O.C.* 260-62.

⁶*Infra*, chap. iv.

⁷Eur. frag. 937.

Haply with you guest-murder is as nought,
But to us which be Greeks foul shame is this.¹

Of another set of Greek morals, refusal to torture or kill captives, or to mutilate the enemy corpses, only one trace appears in tragedy. This quotation shows that the captive was not to be put wantonly to death.

Now therefore since, when I was fain to die,
They slew me not, by all the Hellene laws
My death pollution brings on whoso slays.²

All of the foregoing examples show a clear sense of Hellenic consciousness. The Greeks realized that in race, language, literature, dress, religion, and many observances arising from religious belief they formed a group distinct from their neighbors. Although, as we must remember, the preceding citations are not a complete list of the appearance of these ideas in tragedy but only those examples which show that the Greeks themselves recognized these facts as the basis of Hellenic unity, we cannot fail to conclude, on the basis of this evidence, that the cultural unity of the Greeks was clearly recognized by them during the fifth century. In so far as awareness went, the Greeks were aware of their kinship, both racial and cultural, with one another.

The further question remains. If the Greeks were thus conscious that they were a distinct group, did this realization have any practical effect? That is, did Panhellenic feeling stop simply with existence; or did it produce actual results? These results would then be what I have chosen to call Panhellenism of the second degree, the conduct of inter-Hellenic affairs in the light of this Panhellenic consciousness.

As for such actual Panhellenic effort as was made by the Greeks through the organization of leagues of various kinds, probably the most definitely Panhellenic was the Pylic Amphictyony.³

¹Eur. Hec. 1247-48.

²Eur. Herac. 1009-1011.

³Busolt, op. cit., I, 681 ff.; Grote, op. cit., II, 244-54. "Twelve sub-races, out of the number which made up entire Hellas, belonged to this ancient Amphiktyony, the meetings of which were held twice in every year: in the spring at the temple of Apollo at Delphi; in the autumn at Thermopylae, in the sacred precinct of Demeter Amphiktyonis. Their special and most important function consisted in watching over the Delphic temple, in which all the twelve sub-races had a joint interest, and it was the immense wealth and national ascendancy of this temple which enhanced to so great a pitch the dignity of its acknowledged ministrators" (Grote, op. cit., II, 249).

At least, this league was Panhellenic in the sense that it was not, as were the Peloponnesian and Delian Leagues, plainly under the continual domination of one power. To this organization Sophocles makes the only allusion:

When at thy Gates, far-famed from times of old,
Greeks council held.¹

Aside from this brief reference, no mention is made of any Panhellenic efforts in the political field.

Furthermore, not only is the preceding quotation the only mention of such Panhellenism as did exist in practice; but the extant plays contain not a single direct plea for greater unity in the future. As possible indirect allusions to a desire for increased cooperation among the Greeks, two passages have been noted.² The first of these is Megara's exposition of the hopes which she and Heracles had for their children:

So with three princedoms would your sire exalt
His three sons, in the pride of his great heart.
And I chose out the choice of Hellas' brides,
Linking to ours by marriage Athens' land,
And Thebes and Sparta, that ye might, as ships
Moored by sheet anchors, ride the storms of life.³

Since this reference to Panhellenism is, at best, indirect, it must be considered according to the rules already mentioned⁴ to determine whether the poet seems to have intended such an allusion as we may choose to see in the passage. In this speech, Megara is lamenting the untimely death which she fears is about to overtake her children. In this recital of blasted hopes, nothing is more natural than that she should include the plans which she had made for their marriages. That these unions should be with the royal families of other great states was a normal custom. The statement is, then, quite fitting to the action of the play, is brief, and is not particularly emphasized. In regard to these points, Megara seems to be saying only what is suitable for her to say as a character in the play and not speaking the ideas of her author. Are there, however, other details which seem to show that Euripides intended a reference to his own times?

Hettich feels that he sees one in an anachronism which the speech contains. His comment is: "That some contemporary

¹Trach. 638.

²Cited by Hettich, op. cit., p. 69.

³Eur. Her. F. 474-79.

⁴Supra, p. 11.

allusion is intended is made more plausible by the consideration that in the time of Heracles (whenever that was) the three states mentioned were not the outstanding ones in Hellas."¹ In other words, at the time of Heracles and Megara, Athens, Sparta, and Thebes were not the chief cities of Greece. Consequently, when the father and mother sought to unite their house with those of the great cities of Greece, they would have selected those cities which were important at the time of Heracles, not Athens, Sparta, and Thebes which had then not yet grown to greatness. Consequently, Hettich reasons, the fact that Euripides mentions the three great cities of his own time--the late fifth century--seems to show that the poet intended a contemporary reference to them. That is, to get a Panhellenic idea across to his audience, Euripides willfully violated chronology, and showed three warring cities of his own time as united.

This anachronism, if we may interpret it in this fashion, is important for it would then give to the speech a turn which would enable us to consider it as a contemporary allusion. And so, of course, it may be. On the other hand, my personal faith is considerably shaken by a similar passage in another Euripidean play which is dramatically dated "in the time of Heracles," the Alcestis. In that play² the chorus says that the praises of Alcestis will be sung at Sparta and at Athens. In other words, two of the three cities appear again in another passage where they are equally out of place chronologically, yet where the anachronism seems to be of no importance. In the Alcestis, the poet wished to say that his heroine's praises would be sung in the great cities of Greece. In Euripides' time those cities were Athens and Sparta; so he used those names. In the Heracles, too, it seems to me, the tragedian, seeking three cities with which he could ally the sons of Heracles, chose the great cities of his own time, not of the time of Heracles. In view of the parallelism, we perhaps cannot place too much emphasis on the anachronism.

On the other hand, the anachronism is rather flagrant. In another passage³ Euripides states the accepted view that all the Greek groups, Dorians, Ionians, Aeolians, and Achaeans, were

¹Hettich, op. cit., p. 69. Cf. infra, p. 43, n. 7.

²445-454.

³Ion 1571-94, quoted supra, p. 20.

descendents of these same sons of Heracles; consequently, the three cities had, as has already been pointed out, the unity of common blood. Perhaps then, this additional hint of union was the poet's attempt to foster further this Panhellenic relationship. At any rate, the passage is suggestive.

The second passage suggested by Hettich¹ is:

O foolish states which might by parley end
Feuds, yet decide them in the field of blood.²

Since this play is concerned with the strife between Greek states, the meaning of the statement seems to be that between themselves the Greek cities should settle their disputes by peaceful methods rather than by war. Hettich suggests³ that this desire for peaceful settlement of disputes arises from a Panhellenic sentiment. On the other hand, as Hettich himself points out,⁴ the humanitarian desire to check the horror of war is "by no means incompatible with the most uncompromising nationalism and advocacy of war." As a result, the evaluation of the passage can best be made by considering the tone of the entire play in which it occurs. This consideration will be reserved for the following chapter.

¹Op. cit., p. 69.

²Eur. Supp. 748-49.

³Op. cit., p. 47.

⁴Ibid., pp. 46-48.

CHAPTER III

THE PANHELLENIC TONE OF THE PLAYS

The preceding chapter has been devoted to the individual references to Panhellenic sentiment and its results as they appear in our extant tragedy. In that treatment, the examples were grouped according to subject, the type of Panhellenic sentiment they represent; no attempt was made, however, to consider these examples in their relation to the particular plays in which they appear, to their authors, or to the contemporary political background of the time of their presentation. Yet without an evaluation of these elements, no satisfactory understanding of the type of Panhellenic sentiment in tragedy or its prevalence can be attained.

The present chapter, therefore, will treat separately those plays which are particularly pertinent to the subject under discussion, and the various points brought out in relation to these plays should furnish us with sufficient evidence to explain the quality as well as the quantity of Panhellenic sentiment in all the tragedies. In order to bring out the relation of the plays to the political events of the time, the order of treatment will be roughly chronological; but in certain instances, this procedure will be abandoned.

During the early period of tragedy, a particular type of play appeared, the historical play.¹ These plays took their plots, not from the stories of mythology, but from actual events of the time. Of this type of drama, we know three examples, the Phoenician Women, by Phrynichus, the Capture of Miletus, also a work of Phrynichus which has come down to us by title alone,² and one extant play, the Persians of Aeschylus.

For the study of Panhellenism, the loss of the Capture of Miletus is a serious one. A drama which showed to the Athenians the evils which their fellow Greeks suffered, partially through

¹Teuffel-Wecklein, Aschylos Perser (Leipzig, 1901), p. 3; A. Sidgwick, Persae (Oxford, 1903), p. vi.

²Nauck, TGF, p. 721.

Athenian neglect, was possibly filled with Panhellenic appeal of the most direct and vigorous sort. Certainly the presentation must have been vivid to have produced such a violent reaction as it did on the part of the audience.¹ The play was, in a measure, the dramatic portrayal of the dire consequences of local self-interest and independence as opposed to the common good of all Greeks.

Since we have not a single fragment, speculation is idle as to how far the author may have attacked directly through the speeches of the characters the Greeks' ingrained love of individual action by the single city-states. On the other hand, no unfounded conjecture in this regard is necessary. Even if the dramatist placed no direct appeals or propaganda in the mouths of his characters, a lesson would have been taught by the plot alone.²

Herodotus³ states that the reason for the fine and ban was that the play "reminded the Athenians of their own misfortunes." Admittedly, the presentation of the sack of a Greek town by the Persians would be disquieting to the nerves of the Athenians, who had begun to fear for themselves the menace of the invader. In the tragic catharsis fear for personal safety probably played a greater part than pity. In so far as the reaction of the Athenians was motivated only by this fear for themselves, the play was not of Panhellenic importance.

On the other hand, is it not possible that other elements were present, and that the actions of the Athenians were caused, at least in part, by consciousness of their relationship to the Milesians as fellow Greeks? In the early stages of the Ionian revolt, Athens had dispatched twenty ships.⁴ To this extent they had made common cause with the Greeks of Ionia. But, after taking sufficient part to bring their activity to the attention of the

¹Herod. vi. 21. The poet was fined, and the play banned from second presentation.

²The actual narrative of the story, whatever the dramatic treatment, probably followed the historical event closely. In the Persians, Aeschylus in his description of Salamis has the accuracy of an historical source. F. Van Hoffs, De rerum historicarum in Aeschyli Persis tractatione poetica (Cologne, 1866), passim.

³Supra, n. 1.

⁴Herod. v. 97, 99.

King,¹ they returned home² and took no part in the siege of Miletus.

Local isolation and independence were deeply rooted in the Greek character. In the case of Miletus, the Athenians had failed to act, presumably, because they did not realize that the matter was their immediate concern. During most of the Athenian history, unless the enemy stood in Attica and actually threatened Athens, the average Athenian felt that the danger was no affair of his.³ In this narrow view the interests of Athens obscured the vision of the needs of Greece as a whole.

Phrynichus had shown how a Greek city was sacked by barbarians without Athens raising a hand. Is it then not possible that the tragedian had not only told the sad tale of Miletus and reminded the Athenians of their own danger, but had criticized their entire political method? Did his play not imply, to some extent, that the fortune of one member of the Hellenic group was the concern of all the Hellenes whether their immediate interests were involved or not? Perhaps then, we may assume that part of the resentment of the Athenians towards this play and its author was caused by their own realization that they had been false to their Panhellenic duty. Although Phrynichus may not have advocated Panhellenic unity, he implied perhaps a Panhellenic point of view. Although we have no evidence of any kind which would show that such Panhellenic feeling influenced in any way the reception accorded to the Capture of Miletus, nevertheless, the fact, that Athens a few years later did form a league to free the Ionians would seem to point to the existence of such feeling at that earlier time. Consequently, in the study of Panhellenic sentiment, the Capture of Miletus deserves comment even if the statements in regard to it must be tentative or merely suggestive.

Phrynichus also wrote another historical play which now survives in only a few fragments,⁴ the Phoenician Women. Since Aeschylus, however, treated the same theme in an extant play and

¹Herod. v. 105. Whether the anecdote of Darius' shooting the arrow is true or not, the fact that Athens had become conspicuous remains.

²Herod. v. 103.

³Arist. Peace 242-45; Demos. vi. 7-8; ix. 9-16; x. 15-16.

⁴Nauck, TGF, pp. 772-73.

since his treatment owed much to Phrynichus,¹ the best course is not to speculate about the Phoenician Women, but to study the Persians of Aeschylus and to allow that study to suffice for both plays.

The Persians is in many ways a Panhellenic play. Salamis was a shining example of Greek unity. For once the commander could exhort his men as Greeks,² not as members of single city states. As in Aristophanes' Peace,³ the force was one of Greeks drawn up together on behalf of all Greece. The battle was a glorious triumph: the Greeks, united, had defeated the barbarians. The emphasis of the play is upon that triumph. In fact, the theme of the play, although certainly not the tone, as we shall see later, smacks somewhat of our own patriotic oratory. Aeschylus gave a detailed and thrilling account of a battle in which the Greeks took great pride. He showed the grief and despair which the news of that conflict produced in the enemy's land. In so far as the play tells of a Greek victory and would make every Hellene glory in the achievement and take pride in being a member of the Hellenic group, the play is Panhellenic. Furthermore, as the previous citations show, in the text of the play itself there is a feeling of national consciousness.

At the same time, anyone reading the play with the point of the present study in mind is struck by one great omission: nowhere does the poet directly and expressly state that the victory depended largely on the fact that the Greeks were united. On the whole, the main cities of Greece were represented. They fought as one navy under one plan. Whether this unity was secured by the wiles of Themistocles⁴ or by the force of circumstance,⁵ union was the source of victory. Yet Aeschylus omits any direct mention of the fact that the Greeks were united, that this unity was responsible for the victory, or that the result should teach the Greeks to stand together thereafter.

To be sure, this unity is implied. The war-cry has already been mentioned. Aside from certain emphasis on the part played by Athens, an emphasis warranted in part by historical truth, in

¹Cf. the hypothesis to the Persians; also A. W. Verrall, Bacchants and Other Essays (Cambridge, 1910), pp. 283 ff.

²Pers. 403-405.

³292. Cf. supra, pp. 6, 14.

⁴Herod. viii. 75.

⁵CAH, IV, 306.

part by the fact that the play was produced before an Athenian audience,¹ Aeschylus speaks of the force as "Greeks." Further, since the play was produced before an audience which was not only well informed of the event but which had personally witnessed it, the author might assume that the unity of the Greeks and its importance were realized by his hearers and would be supplied by them. For the purpose of the play, Greek unity was sufficiently implied if not expressly stated.

On the other hand, in the study of Panhellenic sentiment and, particularly, its expression in tragedy, the possible reasons why this unity is implied and not stated directly and why no moral is pointed are of sufficient importance to merit discussion later in this chapter.²

The three preceding plays stand apart from the rest of the tragic corpus. They were sports which failed to propagate themselves. After this time, tragedy ceased to draw its plots from recent historical events, and took its themes from the stories of a few famous houses of legendary times.³ In a measure, the plots of these historical plays were much better fitted for comment on political happenings. Based on historical events, they were in themselves a sort of commentary on those events despite the fact that their comment had a religious and moral emphasis. On the other hand, as we shall see, the themes drawn from myth and legend could, by proper handling, be made to reflect fifth century Athens and Greece.

Some years before the production of the Persians, Aeschylus had written a play which, though not based on an historical event, had certain similarities to the Persians in its Panhellenic tone. Like the Persians, the Suppliants⁴ presents the struggle between Greek and barbarian, but in this case it is the Danaïdes fleeing from their Egyptian wooers. The Panhellenic element in the play

¹Cf. infra, pp. 55-56.

²Cf. infra, pp. 51 ff.

³Aristotle Poet. 1453a.

⁴The date is uncertain; probably the piece was staged in the first decade of the fifth century. Cf. H. Rose, Handbook of Greek Literature (London, 1931), p. 149, n. 63; W. Schmid, Geschichte der Griechischen Literatur (Munich, 1934), p. 194.

has been well brought out by Tucker.¹ In brief excerpts his theory is as follows:

We might well regard the Egyptians as representatives of orientals in general, and suppose an allusion to the threatened attack on Attica by the Persians which subsequently took place at Marathon.

And it may be noted, as in keeping with this theory of the play, that the spirit of the play is distinctly Panhellenic. There are no separate states, Argos, Athens, Sparta, etc., but one Pelasgia embracing all continental Hellas.

In view of resistance, Aeschylus wishes to envoke the Panhellenic sentiment or to bring to remembrance the Panhellenic fact; and that the prayers for Argos refer on the one hand to the late sufferings of Argos (494 B.C. Herod. vi. 83) in particular at the hands of Sparta, on the other to the harms that all Hellas meets with through its internal dissensions.

In some details, of course, this theory is open to question. The play may antedate the destruction of Argos;² and Aeschylus may not have actually anticipated the Persian invasion. In any case, as the citations in the previous chapter show, the play shows a marked awareness of the distinction between Greek and barbarian. Not only is there contrast, but there is conflict as well. Hence, in so far as the play shows a united Greece struggling against the barbarians and fighting to preserve respect for its power and reverence for its customs, the Suppliants is distinctly a Panhellenic play. If Tucker's view is correct and Argos is intended to remind the audience of the horror of strife between Greeks, the message of peace, if not unity, among the Greeks is stressed so much the more.

The plays previously discussed all fall in the period which may be classed roughly as that of the Persian War. This strife against a common enemy produced a feeling of unity among the Greeks which appears to be reflected in the Panhellenism of the four plays already mentioned. Historically, the years which followed may be grouped in the period between the repulse of Persia and the beginning of the Peloponnesian War. During this time, the dramatist whose works are most important is Sophocles. He is the tragedian of the Age of Pericles, the time of Athens' greatest glory at home and the spread of her empire abroad. Such allusions as the poet might choose to make to these important events would be of interest were they not hotly disputed.

¹The Suppliants of Aeschylus (London, 1889), pp. xxi-xxiv.

²Rose, op. cit., p. 149.

Two prominent examples will suffice for illustration. Sophocles produced the Philoctetes in 409 B.C. It has been suggested, accordingly, that in this play which portrays the recall of that hero to the host which could not succeed without him, the poet is alluding to the recall of Alcibiades in 411 B.C. and his aid in securing the victory of Cyzicus in 410 B.C. Jebb, who may be taken as a fair critic, complains,¹ that anyone who believes that the poet chose the plot and worked out the play with this in mind, "wrongs him grievously as a poet."

In like manner, this same critic decrys the finding of political allusions in the Oedipus at Colonus.² Lachmann had suggested that the play was wholly propaganda designed to foment Athenian patriotism at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War. To this theory Jebb retorts:³

He [Sophocles] had a political sympathy if not a political purpose. . . . The Oedipus Colonus contains perhaps one verse in which we might surmise that the poet is thinking of his own days (1537 on the mutilation of the Hermes), but it does not contain a single word which could be interpreted as directly alluding to them.

When such a sympathetic student as Jebb makes such a decision on two of the most possibly allusive of the Sophoclean plays, it is dangerous to press other passages. In any event, nowhere does Sophocles seem to me to be making even the most indirect reference to active Panhellenism. Consequently, we must pass by the works of Sophocles and the period in which he wrote⁴ and come to Euripides and the Peloponnesian War.

Three plays of Euripides concern themselves particularly with political events of the time at which they were produced. So political is their content that they have been frequently

¹Philoctetes (Cambridge, 1890), p. xlii.

²This passage is, of course, much more open to Panhellenic interpretation than the preceding.

³Oedipus at Colonus (Cambridge, 1900), p. xxxix.

⁴By strict chronology, of course, my present grouping of the dramatists by period is incorrect. The Orestes-trilogy of Aeschylus falls in the period which I have assigned to Sophocles, while at least the two plays of that author which have just been mentioned appeared long after the beginning of the Peloponnesian War. In the same fashion, the early plays of Euripides appeared before the war. For the study of the present question, however, this grouping seems best to bring out the development and does not, I believe, do violence to the evidence.

grouped together and even called political pamphlets.¹ Of these three plays, the earliest is probably the Andromache.² In the study of Panhellenism this play is important, not for the evidence which it offers, but for the contrast which it affords for this play is not Panhellenic, but a war play filled with tirades against Sparta. At this early stage of the war, probably near the time of the invasions of Attica,³ feeling against Sparta was running high, and Euripides, in his play, launches his invectives:

O ye in all folk's eyes most loathed of men,
Dwellers in Sparta, senates of treachery,
Princes of lies, weavers of webs of guile,
Thoughts crooked, wholesome never, devious all,--
A crime is your supremacy in Greece!
What vileness lives not with you?--swarming
Covetousness? Convicted liars, saying
This with the tongue, while still your hearts mean that.⁴

Though one should essay,
Virtuous could daughter of Sparta never be.
They gad abroad with young men from their homes,
And with bare thighs and loose disgirdled vesture
Race, wrestle with them--things intolerable
To me! And is it wonder-worthy then
That ye train not your women to be chaste?⁵

If spear-renown
And battle-fame be ta'en from Sparta's sons,
In all else are ye meanest of mankind.⁶

In as much as all these statements are dramatically appropriate to the play's plot of the close of the Trojan War,⁷ any application of them to the fifth century must be indirect. On the other hand, the hatred of Sparta is expressed so plainly and so fully that obviously the poet and his audience would be thinking of the affairs of their own day.

¹Cf. P. Decharme, Euripides and the Spirit of His Drama, trans. Loeb (New York and London, 1906), pp. 119-42; H. Weil, De tragicis graecis cum rebus publicis conjunctione (Halle, 1865).

²The dating of this play is one of the old cruces of classical scholarship. The probable date is "early in the Peloponnesian War." Cf. Rose, op. cit., p. 185; Christ-Schmid, Geschichte der Griechischen Litteratur (6th ed.; Munich, 1912), p. 362 and n. 2; G. Norwood, Greek Tragedy (London, 1920), p. 219, n. 7.

³Thuc. 11. 18-19.

⁴And. 445-452.

⁵Ibid., 595-601.

⁶Ibid., 724-26.

⁷That the references to the life and dress of the Spartan girls and to the military prowess of the men is, for the time of the Trojan War, an anachronism should be considered in judging the value of Her. F. 474-79. Cf. supra, pp. 33-35.

This play is a real war-play. It shows the audience's present enemy as a villain of villains, committing atrocities against helpless women and children. The play fairly breathes the war spirit. There is no thought here that the Spartans too are Greeks and that any aspersions cast on them are insults to all Hellenes and hence to the Athenians as well. Nor is the older feeling present that the outrages against the barbarians which Homer and the Cyclic poets related could be condoned because they were against barbarians. Quite to the contrary, the Spartans are treated only as Spartans, the enemies of the Athenians and as such are bitterly attacked to please the angry feelings of an Athenian audience. Even barbarians can appear as the innocent victims of Spartan villains. No play could be further from the Panhellenic ideal. The Andromache is an expression of local patriotism of the most limited kind.

The plays of Aristophanes in approximately this period stand in sharp contrast. In 525 B.C. the comic poet produced the Acharnians in which he dared to plead for a rational rather than an emotional consideration of the war. His Just-Citizen had had his vines cut down too and held no special brief for Sparta. But he was willing to assert with his head on the block that the Spartans were not alone to blame.¹ In the Peace of 421 B.C. his hero flew to Heaven on a bottle-charger for "all the Hellenes"; and in a play filled with Panhellenic feeling and propaganda the poet tried to show the advantages of a willingness on the part of the Greeks to pull together figuratively as well as literally. Aristophanes, in the same period which saw the production of the Andromache, dared to insist that they were all Greeks and that war was foolish and unwanted. Euripides did the reverse. The plot was a story from the Trojan War, one great example of the united effort of the Greeks. Yet the tragedian not only took a story which was far removed from any incident of such united action, but handled the story in such a way as to throw the Spartan character into the worst possible light. In view of his treatment of the story, it seems likely that he chose the plot with such treatment in mind. The drama was a war play designed to arouse the righteous indignation and fighting spirit of the Athenians. Euripides was willing, in this play, to yield to the war spirit

¹Acharn. 510 ff.

and to foster city-patriotism. He had, at this time, no Panhellenic message.

In the second war-play of Euripides, the Children of Heracles the subject of the political allusions is not quite so clear as in the Andromache since some see references to Sparta and others to Argos.¹ The earlier critics of the play were impressed by certain speeches which attack Argos so vehemently that it seemed likely that some contemporary political allusion was intended; in other words, enmity between Athens and Argos had sprung up at this time, and the Children of Heracles would be the dramatic expression of that hatred. The lines which gave rise to that opinion are:

Begone! I fear not that thine Argos, I!
'Twas not for thee to shame me and to drag
These hence by force. This city which I hold
Is not to Argos subject: she is free²

Ay, vaunt as thou wilt, yet uncaring
Will we swerve none the more from the right,
O thou stranger from Argolis faring
To Athens, thou shalt not affright
Our souls by thy bluster high-swelling.
Nor yet such dishonour be done
To the land great and fair beyond telling!
Fools--thou and thy despot-lord dwelling
In Argos, this Sthenelus' son!³

Dread peril, that Mycenae-town--
The mighty burg, whose hand
The wide-world through hath spear-renown,--
Nurse wrath against my land!
Yet shame, O shame, were thine, my city,
If we must yield to Argos' hest
Suppliants,--if fear cast out pity!⁴

If this scornful treatment of Argos points to contemporary events, we have here an outburst similar to that against Sparta in the preceding play.⁵

¹In the Andromache also, the speech of Menelaus in lines 732 ff. has caused much discussion. In my opinion, Verrall (Four Plays of Euripides [Cambridge, 1905], p. 34) is correct and mention is made of another city only for dramatic convenience. However, Hettich (op. cit., p. 42, n. 71) suggests a vassal-state in Laconia or Messenia. Others think the reference is to Argos (Haigh, Tragic Drama of the Greeks [Oxford, 1896], p. 297; Hyslop, Euripides' Andromache [London, 1900], pp. xvii-xix).

²The speech of Theseus, 284-87.

³353-361.

⁴759-765.

⁵The Children of Heracles would then have to have been produced in 418 B.C. or early in 417 B.C. Before 418 Argos

On the other hand, certain considerations would seem to show that the play was not produced during a period of Athenian hostility with Argos and that it was not directed against that city.¹ The more acceptable opinion seems to be to regard this play, like the Andromache, as an attack on Sparta.² If the play has this purpose, the point is even clearer.

The Athenians seem to have believed, more or less, that their rescue of the Heracleidae was an historical fact.³ Further, Diodorus Siculus relates⁴ that the Spartans seemed to have acknowledged the rescue also, and, since they believed that they were the descendents of the Heracleidae, did not ravage in their invasions that territory in which the Heracleidae were supposed to have found sanctuary.

The very presentation of this play was, then, a jibe at Sparta. In earlier days, the ancestors of the Spartans had found safety in Attica. Yet, instead of being grateful for this historical favor, the descendents of these very children were warring against the offspring of their benefactors. Nor is the poet content to let this fact be implied; rather, he states it definitely at the close of the play. There Eurystheus, about to be put to death by Alcmena, prophesies the future faithlessness⁵ and ingratitude of the descendents of the Heracleidae and promises to protect Athens:

was neutral in the Peloponnesian War and, consequently, there would have been no ground for this hostility against her. In this year (Thuc. v. 76 ff.) she made her alliance with Sparta. But in 417 the democracy again came into power at Argos and friendship with Athens was again resumed. Hence, if this invective against Sparta is a contemporary allusion, the play appeared between the Argive-Spartan alliance and the restoration of democracy at Argos.

¹The principal evidence against this view is the scholiast on Aristophanes' Wasps 1160, who noted the line as a parody on the Children of Heracles 1006. If that is the case, since the Wasps was produced in 423 B.C., the Children of Heracles must have been presented in 424 B.C. or earlier.

²The date is then about the same time as the Andromache (Rose, op. cit., pp. 186-7; Norwood, op. cit., p. 220; L. Meridier, [Paris, 1925], I, 195).

³Demos. xvii. 186.

⁴xii. 45.

⁵Cf. 309-326.

Slay: I ask not thy grace. But I bestow
 On Athens ~~who~~ hath spared, who hath shamed to slay me,
 An ancient oracle of Loxias,
 Which in far days shall bless her more than seems.
 Before the Virgin's shrine Pallanian;
 So I, thy friend and Athens' savior aye,
 A sojourner shall lie beneath your soil,
 But to these and their children sternest foe
 What time they march with war-hosts hitherward,
 Traitors to this your kindness:--such the guests
 Ye championed!

Ill home-return will I give thy sons' sons
 For this! Of me ye shall have double gain,--
 My death shall be your blessing and their curse.¹

In short, the situation in regard to this play is much the same as that of the Andromache. Euripides chose his plot and developed it with the definite intention of writing a war play. He showed the greatness of Athens as the refuge of the oppressed; he cast slurs on Sparta. But he did not preach Panhellenism.

The Peloponnesian War continued. Then, about the time of the Peace of Nicias² Euripides produced another play which is closely connected with the events of the war, the Suppliants. In fact, the play is filled with allusions which show Athens' affections and hatreds at the time.

The old hatred of Sparta still crops up:
 Perchance thou askest, "Why pass by the land
 Of Pelops, and on Athens lay this charge?"
 Sooth, right it is that I should answer this--
 Sparta is heartless, never at one stay:
 The rest be small and weak.³

At the same time, several passages⁴ point to a friendly feeling towards Argos and perhaps anticipate the alliance brought about by Alcibiades.⁵

But the main attack is upon Thebes. The plot of the drama--the refusal of Thebes to yield the bodies of the fallen Seven until compelled by Athens--was probably suggested to Euripides by the recent refusal of Thebes to give up the Athenian dead after the battle of Delium.⁶ As we saw in the preceding

¹1026-44.

²Giles, CR, IV (1890), 95 ff.; G. Murray, Euripides (Oxford), Vol. II; G. Ammendola, Le Supplici (Palermo, 1922), pp. 13-15; Norwood, op. cit., p. 234, n. 6.

³184-88.

⁴1169-73, 1176-79, 1191-95.

⁵Thuc. v. 46. 5.

⁶424 B.C. Thuc. iv. 97 ff.

chapter,¹ a common ritual for the burial of the dead and a common belief in the necessity of these rites was one of the great bonds which united the Greeks. No matter how bitter the war, the defeated had the right to negotiate with the possessors of the field for the recovery of the slain. Only exceptional animosity could cause the denial of that petition. And such refusal is essentially "un-Greek" and "barbarous"; it ran counter to the "law of the Hellenes." Any city which was guilty of this transgression suffered a reproach in the eyes of all the Greeks. Yet once before, in the legendary past, Thebes had been guilty of this crime when Creon refused burial to Polyneices. For the ancient spectator, Antigone was a heroine because she carried out Hellenic religious law in the face of a cruel edict worthy only of a barbarian or an atheist. When her attempt failed, Athens saw to it that the law of the gods was not scorned.

From this old story, Euripides could feel certain that his hearers would draw the exact and obvious parallel. Consequently, in so far as the play shows Thebes as a transgressor of custom and religious law, the play is war-drama. An Athenian poet is attacking the enemy. But the interesting point for our present purpose is the Panhellenic basis of his appeal. As the relatively frequent citations in the previous chapter make clear, Euripides as well as Theseus is emphasizing the fact that this disregard for Hellenic wont is the concern of all Hellas.

But the poet does not stop here. In the passages

For, when for war a nation casteth votes,
Then of his own death no man maketh count,
But passeth on to his neighbor that mischance.
But, were death full in view when votes were cast,
Never war-frenzied Greece would rush on ruin.
Yet, of elections twain, we know--all know--
Whether is best, the blessing or the curse,
And how much better is peace for men than war;
Peace, she which is the Muses' chiefest friend,
But Retribution's foe, joys in fair children,
In wealth delights. Fools let these blessings slip,
And rush on war: men bringeth weaker man
To bondage; city is made city's thrall.²

O foolish states which might by parley end
Feuds, yet decide them in the field of blood.³

¹Supra, pp. 29-30.

²481-93.

³748-49.

Hapless mortal!
 Why do ye get spears and deal out death
 To fellow-men? Stay, from such toils forbear,
 And peaceful mid the peaceful ward your towns.¹

he evinces a feeling that he is tired of war. Nor is this all: as far as we can judge from the passage, the war which he decrys is war of Greek with Greek. In these pacifistic expressions there is probably an element of Panhellenism. True, this Panhellenism may end with the realization that the Greeks form a group apart from the rest of the world and that they should, consequently, get along together. In any event, the tone has changed from that of the Andromache and the Children of Heracles.

About five years later, 415 B.C., the poet produced another play which is closely related to that just considered.

As the war progressed, Euripides seems to have grown heartily sick of it, and increasingly uncertain that Athens was the champion of righteousness. About December 416 or January 415 occurred the capture and destruction by the Athenians of Melos, a small Dorian island community whose only offence was trying to remain neutral. It is commonly held that indignation at this deed, the one completely unjustifiable action of Athens throughout the war, roused Euripides to write his Trojan Women, though if so he must have composed and staged the play very rapidly since it appeared at the Great Dionysia of 415, i.e., about March. However this may be, the work is rather a pageant of the miseries of war, more especially of defeat, than a tragedy.²

In the main, the plea of the Trojan Women is for peace. But, as in the Suppliants, Euripides seems to base his appeal, at least in part, on a hatred of war which arises from Panhellenic feeling. If truly he is rebuking Athens for her inhumanity towards Melos, he may well, from a Panhellenic point of view, reproach them with

O Greeks who have found out cruelties un-Greek³
 or question the basis for their action by inquiring

But what custom shall this be that Hellenes share,
 Or what this statute?⁴

In the period between the Andromache and the Trojan Women we see, then, that the attitude of Euripides underwent a considerable change. In the two tragedies which appeared early in the course of the war, the poet attacked the enemies of Athens. Without regard for the idea that Panhellenic unity should be considered even in time of war, Euripides produced plays which, if they did

¹949-52.

²Rose, op. cit., pp. 186-87.

³764.

⁴266-67.

not arouse strife and hatred, at least pandered to that already in existence. As the war went on, his viewpoint changed; and, while the Suppliants still contains jibes at the enemy, a note of peace, based on Panhellenic brotherhood is heard, a note sounded more clearly in the Trojan Women.

But it was probably about the time that the war was ending¹ and with the war, Athens' hope of empire, that Euripides turned to the writing of his great Panhellenic play, the Iphigenia at Aulis. In epic, the story of the sacrifice of a maiden to secure favorable winds for the fleet was neither particularly tragic nor Panhellenic. It was simply a shadow of the darker days when human sacrifice was practiced in Greek religion. The girl was no heroine but a dumb victim slaughtered to the blood-thirsty gods by her uncle's desire for revenge or her father's ambition. But Euripides changed all that. No longer is she a mere victim; she becomes a heroine. She gives her life knowingly and willingly. The sacrifice has now become self-sacrifice. Still more important than the surrender of her life is the motivation of her act: she dies for all of Greece. Again and again, the poet drives home this point.² The host at Aulis is a gathering of all Greece, and it is on behalf of all of Greece that Iphigenia offers herself. If, in the Peace, Aristophanes had urged cooperation on behalf of Greece, Euripides here pleads for what must be the basis of that cooperation, willingness to make personal sacrifice for Greece, regardless of the cost.

With this play, our survey of Panhellenism closes. A general summary of the trend is simple. In the early period of tragedy as we have it, the menace and invasion of Persia welded the Greeks together. This ethnic consciousness appears in the plays; then after the threat had passed, a common pride in the achievements of that union still seems to form a bond. But, as the cause which drove the group together is removed, the bond loosens until it seems to snap under the hatreds of the Peloponnesian War. The war-plays appear; but, as the war drags on, desire for peace arises and our summary of the period ends with another Panhellenic play.

The chapter thus far has dealt with Panhellenism as it

¹Rose, op. cit., p. 194; Murray, op. cit., Vol. III.

²Cf. supra, particularly p. 15.

appears in the general tone of the plays or in their themes. This evidence, combined with the specific references to Panhellenism which appear in the plays as cited in the previous chapter, gives a rather complete view of the type of Panhellenic sentiment which appears and the frequency of its occurrence. To some, however, it may be surprising that the Panhellenic sentiment is expressed in so few plays and passages as it is and that this sentiment is for the most part the rather passive variety of recognition of ethnic unity. To those familiar with the Panhellenic attitudes of Aristophanes, Isocrates, and Demosthenes, the expressions of the tragedians may seem scanty and indirect. For this reason, in order to understand the situation in tragedy it might be well to consider the various causes which made the evidence take the shape it now has.

The most obvious reason which might affect the evidence as we have it is one encountered in almost any study of the classics: we have only part of the material. Our thirty-three extant plays are but a small part of the work in this literary form, and our present plays were certainly not selected on the basis of their Panhellenic tone. As a result, it may well be that some of the lost plays contained more Panhellenic sentiment and stated it more directly than those which have come down to us. The Capture of Miletus is a case in point. As has been suggested, it may have been a very Panhellenic play; but we have only its title.

Another group of factors which might influence the kind of expression have to do with the plays themselves. Of these reasons, the first is the type of plots. In some plays, the plot made any expression of Panhellenic sentiment impossible. In the Prometheus, for example, a story of the very early days even of the gods, political comment of any sort is out of place. In this respect, the historical plays were more fortunate. Their plots, taken from political events, would seem to encourage political comment. In fact, the Persians was able, by its plot alone, to imply a Panhellenic message, and, as far as the plot is concerned, would have allowed much more direct statement of Panhellenic propaganda than the author chose to present.

For the most part, however, tragedy took its themes from the "stories of a few famous houses," and this selection of plot probably influenced the material we are studying. To be sure, the author was allowed to take certain liberties with his mythological

material: to produce a Panhellenic play Euripides completely changed the rôle of Iphigenia in her sacrifice at Aulis. Thus the author could work in some political comment into almost any plot. Euripides has given a political turn to the Andromache, the Children of Heracles, and the Suppliants. Each of these plays represents a different source of tragic plots, the Trojan Cycle, the Heracles-myths, and the Theban Cycle; into them all, Euripides managed to inject politics. But any allusion to his own day must be indirect if the dramatic illusion is to be preserved at all. As a result, the expression of Panhellenic sentiment too must be given only through hints, passing remarks, or emphasis on some parallel which can be drawn by the audience for itself.

In considering the plays we must not forget the men who wrote them. Their personal opinions and character did much to determine whether Panhellenic ideas appeared in their works. Frequent mention has been made of the Panhellenism of Aristophanes. He personally believed in the doctrine and tried to spread it. Had the works of a different comic poet survived and those of Aristophanes been lost, Panhellenism in comedy might be no more prevalent than in tragedy. Or, had Aristophanes been content only to make obscene fun or to write plays like the Plutus, he might have believed in Panhellenism without our being aware of it.

We must therefore remember that we are dealing with only three authors. None of the three may have been personally interested in Panhellenism. Or, even if he was, he might not have chosen to emphasize it in his plays. Aeschylus' attitude in the Persians may well serve as illustration. In one-word characterizations of the Greek tragedians, Aeschylus seems to merit the epithet "religious." His primary concern is the relation of men with the gods and fate. The moral and religious concerns of men interest him more than their political activity. For him, then, Salamis was not an example of how the Greeks could league together and be free and happy. Rather, the Greek victory is simply the divine instrument by which the excessive arrogance of the Persians is laid low. Though the theme of the play is Panhellenic, the tone is deeply religious. The entire emphasis is on the punishment brought by some god to rebuke Xerxes and the Persians.¹ Not only does Aeschylus characterize Darius as wise and good, but he treats Xerxes and the Persians as a whole respectfully. Lack of ability

¹513-16, 533, 719, 725, 744-50, 805-815, 1005-7.

or courage was not the cause of their defeat, but fate.¹ Consequently, although the theme of the play was such as to arouse the most rabid patriotism and probably owed much of its popularity to its glorification of the victory, Aeschylus has not handled the theme in that way. He approached the story of the Persian defeat in the same attitude in which he would a legendary event. In both he would seek a religious truth; and perhaps the lack of direct Panhellenic doctrine in the Persians is to be attributed to the personal bent of the author.

Another possible reason, and probably the most important, is closely connected with the preceding suggestion. Perhaps the lack of direct Panhellenic sentiment is due to religious emphasis, not that of the author, but that of the medium in which he wrote. In other words, the direct expression of such sentiment was barred by the canons of the literary form. Like comedy, tragedy was of religious origin. But comedy, as we know it in the time of Aristophanes, whatever its origin, was very intimately concerned with contemporary political events. Of his early plays, each comedy has an obvious relation to some political event, whether internal or international. For this reason, as far as we can judge from our rather limited evidence, the discussion of such a political question as Panhellenism was perfectly adapted to treatment by the comedians. In tragedy, on the other hand, the situation appears to have been different. The poet did not have a parabasis in which he might express directly his personal opinions. Still more important, however, was the fact that there seems to have been a definite tradition which forbade the poets making direct comment on contemporary politics. By a kind of double entendre, the author might make passing allusion to current events by having his characters utter sentiments applicable both to the character's situation and that of the audience. Of this type of comment, we have noticed several examples. Although the ultimate cause for this contrast between tragedy and comedy may be obscure, the effect is clear. Comedy could and did violate the dramatic illusion and have its actors speak directly to the audience; it did concern itself with political affairs. On the other hand, tragedy was limited to indirect references; and, by something in its very nature, found its proper field in morality and religion. As a result, any direct reference to specific methods of Panhellenism was impossible and even very copious allusion to its existence was difficult.

The last reason which may have affected the presentation of Panhellenic propaganda will be discussed in the following chapter.

¹C. Lundman, Persae Aeschulea quo consilio conscripta videatur (Upsala, 1869), pp. 13-14.

CHAPTER IV

THE ATHENIAN EMPIRE AND PANHELLENISM

In an earlier chapter, the rise of the Athenian empire was mentioned as possibly affecting the presentation of Panhellenic sentiment in Attic tragedy. The preceding chapters have discussed the evidence without any consideration of that empire's existence. The time has now come to make such corrections in our findings as may be necessary when this additional factor is considered. In general there are two possible effects which the empire might have had upon the doctrine of Panhellenism.

First, the Athenian empire would tend to make Panhellenism impossible. The idea of Athens' becoming mistress of the Greek world was so absorbing that patriotism meant only the old loyalty to the city-state and its particular interests even after that state had extended its power over the Mediterranean Basin.

Or second, Panhellenism became merged in the idea of empire. Then patriotism was less selfish and local; and Athenian domination was to result in a league of Greek states, with Athens as leader and director to be sure, yet using this leadership not in its own interests alone, but for the good of all the Greeks.

If either of these possibilities were true, we have an explanation for the lack of active Panhellenic sentiment in Greek tragedy. If the first was true and Panhellenism was lost in the hope of an Athenian empire, then Panhellenism is not found in tragedy because it did not exist, except in the hearts of some individual such as Aristophanes. Athenian patriotism would still be local and devoted to the city-state when the power, but not the vision of that state expanded.

On the other hand, if the second case was true and the Athenian empire was not the expansion of a city-state, but Athenian leadership of a united Greece, we should have been seeking, not direct references to Panhellenism, but rather statements which mention Athens in the rôle of leader of Greece. In other words, Panhellenism will not appear in pleas for a union of the Greek states, but in justification and glorification of the Athenian empire.

Any effort to evaluate the references to Athens and its empire immediately encounters a serious difficulty. The problem is how much of this glorification of Athens, which appears throughout the plays, is intended to have been taken in such a political sense as we suggest. As has already been noted, the tragedies were produced in Athens before an Athenian audience which, if it did not vote the prize directly, probably influenced considerably the opinions of the judges. Or, even if for the moment we discount the influence of the audience, the judges were selected, not as dramatic critics, but as representative Athenians who were a typical cross-section of the audience and likely to be influenced and impressed in much the same way as the audience.

Let us now assume the case of a poet who was writing a play which he desired to win the prize.¹ He had taken all the care within his power to see that the play was of sufficient dramatic and poetic excellence to find favor. What other methods were there by which he could assure himself of success? One of the most obvious was to play upon the emotions of the audience and judges. Of the emotions pride, and patriotism in one sense is only a form of pride, was a likely possibility. A poet who, in presenting a play at Athens, extolled the traditional glory of Athens and its contemporary beauty and power was not likely to be hated by the audience. Besides, the fate of Phrynichus, who reminded the Athenians of Miletus instead of Marathon, was not forgotten.

Consequently, the poets worked hard at their task of "waving the flag" to gain additional good will. Hettich² has collected the material in the works of Euripides, and that evidence is typical of the similar material in the other dramatists. Many times the plots favored the poets. For example, Athens did play a leading part at Salamis, and Oedipus did find refuge at Athens; consequently, in these and other stories, Athens could well be acclaimed as a free and democratic city, the upholder of Hellenic law and freedom, the shelter for the oppressed. Even when the plots were unfavorable--and the plots from the Trojan War did not lend themselves well to the glorification of a city which Homer only mentioned--the poets did their best. For example, the Trojan

¹Cf. supra, p. 10.

²Op. cit., pp. 26-44.

maidens¹ hope that Athens may be the scene of their slavery, a rather anachronistic evidence of the city's fame. In any case, Athens could always be κλεινός or λιπαρός; and so it is with monotonous frequency. Aristophanes put the technique and its results quite clearly:

For before, when an embassy came from the states
intriguing your favour to gain,
And called you the town of the VIOLET CROWN,
so grand and exalted ye grew
That at once on your tiptails erect ye would sit,
these CROWNS were so pleasant to you.
And then, if they added the SHINY, they got
whatever they asked for their praises,
Though apter, I ween, for an oily sardine
than for you and your City the phrase is.²

As for these general praises of Athens, then, her glory, her beauty, and her might, when we consider how many of them must have been pure flattery of Athenian vanity, we can not, in my opinion, assume that they reflect any feeling for Athens' position as head of the Greek league. While all of them may imply that Athens would be a suitable leader, none of them says that Athens was. In the absence of any definite proof, we should go too far, I believe, in assuming that they were intended to convey such a meaning.

If praise of Athens cannot be construed as Panhellenism under the form of the Athenian empire or leadership, are there any references to the empire itself which might be so taken? Because of the nature of tragedy and its plots, these allusions must be, of course, indirect. Hettich, after setting forth in detail the material in regard to the glorification of Athens and her mission as guardian and teacher of Greece, makes the following comment:

Now, the most conspicuous political condition of the age of Euripides was the fact that Athens was the ruler of a great empire consisting of some one hundred and fifty or more cities and states in and bordering on the Aegean, both in Europe and in Asia. And if the exposition of the principles of Athenian democracy in the *Supplikes* and the *Heraclidæ* refers, as it surely does, to the fifth century, do not the labors on behalf of the oppressed and, in general the protective missions we have described mean to recall to the contemporary audience the strenuous activities of Athens against the Persians and the protection she was, at the very moment, still giving to

¹Eur. *Tro.* 207-8.

²Arist. *Acharn.* 636-640.

her subject allies? In other words, is not all this Empire-propaganda?¹

In his study, Hettich was interested in nationalism, not Panhellenism. From his point of view, material of this sort may well be nationalistic, or, more properly, imperialistic propaganda. Our present inquiry is, however, concerned with nationalism only in so far as it is tempered with Panhellenism. To keep the distinction of viewpoint clear, two different terms should be used. For the paternalistic, albeit benevolent, attitude of Athens towards her subject allies, the word "imperialism" will serve. "Nationalism" would then represent the attitude of Athens as head, not ruler, of the united states of Greece. "Imperialism" was the method of Athens at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War. "Nationalism" would have been something like the union which Demosthenes conceived, though less centered in Athens, a league in which Athens had a leading but not decisive voice.²

The glorification of Athens and its rule may be "imperialistic"; but in the absence of any certain evidence to the contrary it is not "nationalistic" in our present limited use of the term. That it was imperialistic, one point may show.

The Iphigenia at Aulis stands unique among the other Greek plays; in it the Panhellenic point of view is stressed in every way. Taking its plot from the concerted action of the Greeks in the Trojan War, the play is Panhellenic to a great degree. Yet this play was among the last which the poet wrote and was composed after all hope of Athenian empire was dashed to earth. If there is a causal relation between the Panhellenism of the Iphigenia at Aulis and the fall of the Athenian empire, we have an answer to the question of the influence of the Athenian empire upon the expression of Panhellenic sentiment. To judge by this case alone, and it is the only basis for decision we have, the existence of the Athenian empire did throttle Panhellenism. Perhaps if we had more plays of Euripides written after the close of the war or more plays of dramatists of the fourth century, we should find more active Panhellenic sentiment.

This view becomes more plausible when we consider the chronological sequence of the plays as given in Chapter Three.

¹Op. cit., pp. 37-38.

²Or the contrast is similar to the difference between the first and second Athenian empires.

under the spur of the danger of the Persians, the poets produced Panhellenic plays. In this regard, the Persians is particularly note-worthy. Some six years before its presentation¹ Athens had become the head of a Panhellenic enterprise to free the Ionian Greeks from Persian domination. This alliance was functioning in conformity to the ideals for which it had been organized. The revolt and subjugation of Naxos² had not yet disillusioned the Greek world with the realization that the Delian League was to become the Athenian empire. Nor had the existence of that empire with its love of power and longing for additional influence yet narrowed the Athenian view of international politics. The League was still a voluntary confederacy of Greek cities. Since in the period between the victory of Salamis and the subjugation of Naxos, actual Panhellenic cooperation in the field of practical politics was at its height, the Panhellenic plays of the period may be only an expression of this feeling.

Then, during the days of empire, little Panhellenism appears in the plays; and, when the Peloponnesian War begins, militarism and war-engendered hatred are supreme. Finally, as the war drags on, the plays show more and more Panhellenic feeling until this sentiment is clearly expressed in the Iphigenia at Aulis.

This point, however, must not be pressed too closely. Our evidence is insufficient, and the causes mentioned in the previous chapter, as well as other influences were active. Nevertheless, to judge from this scrap of evidence we have, we can conclude only that the existence of the Athenian empire probably did play some part in preventing the more open recognition and advocacy of Panhellenism in Attic tragedy.

¹The Delian League was formed about 478 B.C. Thuc. i. 90. 1-2; 95. 7.

²Thuc. i. 97-98.

